Tros Tyriusque mihi nullo discrimine agetur

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW

DECEMBER, 1927

THE SENATE OR THE STATES?

BY THE HON. JAMES W. WADSWORTH, JR.

JOHN CROCKETT calls the roll of the Senate many times during a session of the Congress. As his fine resonant voice rings through the chamber, the Senators present answer "Aye" or "No" or "Here" as occasion requires. The absentees are accounted for by explanations given by their colleagues and are generally protected by "pairs" when a vote is being taken. The routine, as old as the Government itself, is thoroughly familiar to frequent visitors in the galleries. Doubtless there are some people so constant in their attendance that they could, if permitted, call out the names in perfect unison with Crockett. The true "gallery hound" might do even better and reel off the list of general pairs. If school textbooks have not already done so, the Capitol guides do their best to drill it into the heads of visitors that there are two Senators from each of the forty-eight States of the Union. Neither population nor area nor wealth has anything to do with it. The Constitution says: "Two for each State."

The visitor figures out, with no very great mental strain, that there are ninety-six Senators, all told. He takes it for granted that the mandate of the Constitution is respected, and does not bother to count the names as Crockett calls them; but perhaps from now on he would better do so. Indeed, that same visitor might well have counted with Crockett during the last or second

Copyright, 1927, by North American Review Corporation. All rights reserved

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

session of the Sixty-ninth Congress. Had he done so, he would have discovered that instead of ninety-six names on that Senate roll-call, there were but *ninety-five*. How did this happen? Had some Senator died? Had a Senator been expelled? Had some State neglected to elect the Senators to which it was entitled? Had the Senate declared a seat vacant on any grounds? To all such questions the visitor would have received an answer in the negative. And of course he would not think of asking if some Senator had resigned. They don't! What had happened? Just this: Under the rules of the Senate, an incoming Senator must take and subscribe to the oath in the presence of the Senate; until that is done, he has not actually assumed the office with its obligations. A Senator, newly appointed, had been denied the privilege of taking the oath of office. The excluded Senator was Frank L. Smith of Illinois.

Before we attempt to estimate the significance of his exclusion, let us review, briefly, the events leading up to it. The term of the late Senator McKinley of Illinois, was to expire on March 4, 1927, and his successor was to be chosen at the general election on November 2, 1926. Senator McKinley, a Republican, was a candidate to succeed himself. He was a veteran in public life, had served creditably as a member of the House of Representatives for several terms, and for nearly six years as an influential Senator. He had a large and well organized following among Illinois Republicans, enjoyed the undoubted advantage which goes with possession of the office and was, incidentally, a man of great wealth. Frank L. Smith, an adherent of a faction in the party hostile to McKinley and his friends, decided to contest the latter's nomination in the Republican primary, which was to be held on April 13, 1926, and announced his candidacy in November of the preceding year, five months before the primary. A long, gruelling battle ensued. Smith is a man of modest means and could not, himself, bear the financial burden incident to such a contest in a State as large or as populous as Illinois. His friends, therefore, formed a committee to organize his following and finance the campaign. In all, about $250,000 was raised and expended by the committee. Parenthetically, the McKinley organization spent a considerably larger sum. Smith had little

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or nothing to do with raising or spending the money. He was busy on the stump. He contributed $5,000 to the committee's fund.

It is not necessary to examine into the issues upon which this battle was waged; some were of National import and some were merely local or factional. Suffice it to say that when the turmoil and the shouting had died, Smith proved to be the winner, defeating McKinley by more than 100,000 majority. In the November general election, Smith, running as the Republican candidate, was again victorious, defeating his Democratic and Independent opponents by a plurality of 70,000. Thus he was elected a Senator from Illinois for a term of six years commencing March 4, 1927.

In the period between the primary and the general election, a special or select committee of the United States Senate, headed by Senator Reed of Missouri, went to Chicago (July 26 to August 5), and in the exercise of the comprehensive powers conferred upon it proceeded to investigate the Illinois primary campaign. The facts concerning the organization of the Smith committee and the expenditure of $250,000 were brought out. Moreover, it was shown that of this sum, $125,000 had been contributed by Samuel Insull, a wealthy public utilities operator; and especial emphasis was laid upon the fact that Smith, the political beneficiary of this large contribution, was at the time and had been for five years chairman of the Illinois Commerce Commission—a body clothed with broad powers in connection with the regulation of public utilities companies, including the so-called Insull companies. Thus the finger of suspicion was pointed at Smith by the Reed Committee, the inference being to the effect that Insull was rewarding Smith for past favors or paying for favors yet to come. And if this inference were correct, then Smith must be a corrupt person and unfit to sit in the Senate. Furthermore, it was contended that the expenditure of $250,000 by Smith's supporters was grossly excessive and calculated to debauch and corrupt the voters of Illinois. The cry was raised in a portion of the press over the country that Smith's nomination had been purchased.

At this point it is well to remember that there is no Federal statute regulating primaries in which Senators are nominated,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that the laws of Illinois do not place a limit upon the amount which may be contributed by an individual or expended by a political committee in a primary, that there is no evidence whatsoever showing that Smith money was spent illegally or corruptly and, furthermore, that the people were aware of all the facts when they voted for Smith at the general election, and that neither of his opponents in that election was contesting his right to sit. Smith's accusers rested their case entirely upon the *amount* of the expenditure and the fact that Insull contributed one-half of the sum. From this, his unfitness was inferred.

Under ordinary circumstances, Smith, after forwarding his election credentials, would present himself at the Senate and take the oath at the convening of the first session of the Seventieth Congress, in December, 1927. It was understood that opposition would be raised against him at that time, but events moved more rapidly than was anticipated. Senator McKinley died in December, 1926, about three months before the expiration of his term. In accordance with the provisions of the Federal Constitution and the laws of Illinois, it devolved upon the Governor of that State to appoint a person to represent it in the Senate during the remainder of the McKinley term. As Smith had just been elected by the people of Illinois for the full term, it was quite natural for Governor Small to appoint him for the few remaining months of the McKinley term.

The Governor made the appointment. Smith's credentials as Senator-designate were presented to the Senate by Senator Deneen, of Illinois, on January 19, 1927, and Smith himself was ready to take the oath on that day. Senator Deneen moved that Senator Smith be sworn in, with the further provision that all charges brought against him should be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections for investigation and report to the Senate. Whereupon, Senator Reed of Missouri, Chairman of the Investigating Committee, offered the following resolution as a substitute:

> Resolved, that the question of the *prima facie* right of Frank L. Smith to be sworn in as a Senator from the State of Illinois, as well as his final right to a seat as such Senator, be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections; and until such Committee shall report upon and the Senate decide such ques-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tions and right, the said Frank L. Smith shall not be sworn in or be permitted to occupy a seat in the Senate.

The said committee shall proceed promptly and report to the Senate at the earliest possible moment.

It will be noted that the Reed substitute assumed that the Senate might not only question the right of Smith to be sworn in, but might exclude him permanently from taking the oath. After a sharp debate, lasting the greater part of two days, the Senate adopted the Reed resolution by a vote of forty-eight to thirty-three. The Committee on Privileges and Elections failed to report before the end of the session on March 4. Thus was Senator Smith prevented from assuming the duties of his office. Thus it happened that there were but ninety-five names on the Senate roll-call during those last months of the Sixty-ninth Congress.

Here we see an exercise of power of vast significance—the Senate by a majority vote refusing to receive a Senator appointed in strict accordance with the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the State from which he comes and, furthermore, meeting all the qualifications prescribed in the Constitution. And let it be remembered that exclusion of a Senator-designate differs not at all in principle from exclusion of a Senator-elect. Indeed, Smith's opponents have already let it be known that they will attempt a similar exclusion when he presents himself at the opening of the Seventieth Congress as Senator-elect for the full six years term. So the battle is more than likely to be renewed this December. Its final outcome will be influenced by a number of factors—a report from the Committee on Privileges and Elections (if the report is in time to be influential), political considerations affecting the organization of the Senate itself at that time (the body would seem to contain a Republican majority of *one*), similar considerations affecting the Presidential campaign of 1928, and last, but most powerful, the reaction of the American people to this assumption of power by the Senate. It is in the hope that the readers of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW may appreciate the profound importance of the issue, that the writer ventures to discuss it in some of its fundamental aspects.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There are three features of the Constitution which we should examine. One provides that a Senator shall be at least thirty years of age, that he shall have been a citizen of the United States for nine years, an inhabitant of the State he is to represent, and shall not be a member of the Senate while holding a Federal office. Another, contained in the Fourteenth Amendment, provides that no person shall be a Senator who, having previously taken an oath to support the Constitution, shall have engaged in insurrection against the same or given aid or comfort to the enemies thereof, unless the Congress, by a vote of two-thirds of each House, removes the disability. The third is that much discussed provision to the effect that each House shall be the judge of the elections, returns and qualifications of its members.

The first two referred to above give rise to little or no dispute as to their meaning or scope. Likewise, the power of the Senate as judge of the elections and returns of its members is pretty thoroughly understood. It has been exercised upon many occasions. It has often happened that after a Senator-elect has presented credentials from the duly constituted authorities of his State certifying to his election, and after he has assumed his office as a matter of *prima facie* right, contests have been filed against his right to sit. The Senate thereupon has investigated the election and has rendered a decision in accordance with its judgment. There have been one or more such contests in nearly every Congress in recent years.

It may be said that the present controversy rages around the interpretation of the phrase "judge of the . . . qualifications." Some contend that under this provision the Senate has unlimited power over the admission of members. They contend that regardless of the legality of the election and the soundness of the credentials, the Senate may exclude on any ground deemed sufficient by a majority, such as shady reputation, moral turpitude (evidenced at any time), spending in the election more than the majority considers proper, ultra-radical views, doubtful sanity, objectionable affiliations, reprehensible personal habits—in fact, anything which, in the judgment of the majority, indicates unfitness on the part of the Senator-elect. The probability, even the certainty, that Senatorial judgment will vary from time

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to time, and that consequently no fixed standard of fitness can be established, does not deter those who believe in this interpretation. They insist that the Senate possesses and should exercise this unlimited power. Their attitude was reflected quite accurately by Senator Reed of Missouri, when he referred in debate to Senator-designate Smith as an *applicant* for membership—much as if the Senate were a social club and Smith nominated for membership therein by the State of Illinois. Again, it was asserted that if the Senate did not protect itself from contamination, no one else would protect it. Thus, if the people of the State offend the conscience of the Senate (whatever that may be) by electing an "unfit person", the Senate will shut its door in that person's face and the State will go without its equal representation in the Senate until its people learn to send better men to Washington, or until the conscience of the Senate undergoes a change. In any event, the Senate will be supreme. Senator Bingham, with telling sarcasm, suggested that the Constitution should be changed so as to provide that hereafter Senators shall be chosen by the people of the States by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. This may appear absurd, but it is just what has happened in the Smith case. And its repetition is threatened in the next session.

If Smith is excluded when he presents his credentials for the full six years term, what will the people of Illinois do about it? It is hard to suggest anything they can do. For the time being they cannot hold another election and thereby revoke their former decision or elect Smith again. They have already elected Smith to the seat to which Illinois is entitled. Smith holds the credentials. They are irrevocable. They cannot be taken away from him. So it may very well be that Senator-elect Smith will wander around the corridors of the Capitol, knocking occasionally at the Senate door, for a period as long as six years, without being admitted to the Chamber to take the seat assigned by the Constitution to Illinois. Absurd? It is more than that, it is revolutionary; for by this process the Senate becomes the master of the people in the several States, instead of their servant.

As contrasted with the interpretation of Senatorial power adopted by Smith's opponents, which would make possible such

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a spectacle, there is the sound contention that the phrase "judge of the . . . qualifications of its own members" merely empowers the Senate to ascertain whether the member-elect meets those qualifications or is free from those disqualifications set forth in the Constitution itself, and that, having so ascertained, the Senate has no further power in the matter of qualifications. Is the member-elect thirty years of age? Is he an inhabitant of the State he is to represent? Has he been a citizen for nine years? Is he free from the disability mentioned in the Fourteenth Amendment? Is he free from the disability incident to Federal office-holding? The Senate may inquire into these matters and is the sole judge of them; and as it judges, so may it admit or exclude the member-elect. Under no circumstances may the Senate add a qualification or disqualification to those mentioned in the fundamental law. If his credentials are in order (and the Senate is the judge of that), and if he is fully eligible under the Constitution, then the Senator-elect has a *prima facie* right to his office and must be permitted to assume it. To invoke additional qualifications and exclude him if he fails to meet them means, as James Madison said, that "the Legislature might subvert the Constitution". By its action in the Smith case last January, the Senate deprived Illinois of its equal representation in the Senate. It nullified a vital provision of the Constitution. Madison was right.

Some of us may question the good taste or sense of proportion of Smith in failing to prevent Insull from making a heavy contribution to his primary campaign. There may be healthy discussion on that point; but such a consideration must not control our decision. Of supreme importance is the fact that, pursuant to the provisions of the Constitution and the laws of the State and, incidentally, with full knowledge of the primary campaign contributions, the people of Illinois have elected Frank L. Smith as one of their representatives in the United States Senate. The issue confronts us. Shall the legally expressed decision of the people be respected, or shall the Senate be the master?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CHARLES EVANS HUGHES

BY PUBLIUS

After Coolidge, Who? Since it became clear that the President could not be forced to stultify himself by letting others organize to run him when he had said he did not choose to run, several booms held in readiness have been unleashed by their trainers. But behind all this industrious fostering of candidacies for the Republican nomination is clearly manifest a widespread feeling that Charles E. Hughes is the best and strongest candidate that the Republicans can name to succeed Mr. Coolidge.

Mr. Hughes has no machine of propaganda. No friend of his knows that he wants the nomination, or indeed, with certainty, that he would accept it. Here is no opportune bourgeoning of a carefully nurtured political plant, but a spontaneous tribute to character and ability, a turning to him with confidence in his statesmanship and faith in his power of appeal to the voters. This is all the more impressive in that it is not for the most part founded on enthusiasm and personal loyalty. Leaders like Henry Clay, James G. Blaine, and Theodore Roosevelt had the quality of inspiring romantic political attachment. Mr. Hughes has never established or sought such hold on the emotions of his countrymen. Nor has he built up a following by the familiar device of hooking other men's ambitions and interests with his own. Unpossessed of even a nucleus of political organization, unaided by ingratiating arts, nevertheless, more persons in the United States today would designate him as our foremost statesman than would so name any other man.

For more than twenty years since he was first seen in public life they have watched him with increasing respect and admiration. They know beyond question his honesty, his rare disinterestedness, his power of analysis, his clarity of thinking, his steadfastness and poise, and his constructive ability in dealing with difficult domestic and foreign problems. His first public service was

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the correction of corporation abuses, the fair adjustment of rates for millions of consumers of gas, and the protection of insurance policy holders scattered through the whole country. As Governor of New York he enforced effective regulation of public service corporations at the very center of corporate influence. He challenged the entrenched habit of treating party leadership as a private perquisite. These policies brought him enmity that still persists. But the great body of people who were not interested in the selfish schemes of franchise holders or political bosses, honored him for the enemies he had made. They reëlected him Governor in spite of the determinations of politicians to set him aside, and his Governorship is one of the inspiring chapters in the history of New York.

On the bench of the United States Supreme Court he gave six years of distinguished service, and unwillingly reëntered politics solely because he could not decline an unsought nomination for the Presidency when he appeared to be the only man who could heal the Progressive-Republican schism. He coöperated loyally with his rival of that campaign in the war, and was called upon by the Administration for several important tasks. His masterly analysis of the virtues and the defects of the League of Nations Covenant first pointed the way to moderate reservations, which would have resulted in a happy adjustment of that controversy but for the extremists of both sides. His record of four years as Secretary of State is one of brilliant achievement. To him the world owes the unexpected success of the Washington Conference and the only practical progress yet made for the limitation of naval armaments. At a time when international relations are more important than ever before in our history, such leadership as his, at once firm, self-respecting, clear-headed, conciliatory and benevolent, would be of the greatest usefulness to our own people and the greatest promise to the rest of the world.

To meet our domestic problems, he is also admirably equipped. He is a national, not a sectional, figure. He understands the problems of great business, but never has been the slave of business. The corporations that have sought his legal advice because they recognized his great ability have most often seen it demonstrated in curbing business abuses. His judicial temperament

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and habit of thoroughgoing study of all questions presented to him give assurance of fair dealing to every class and section. His whole career has been one of militant championship of justice and impartial dealing.

But all this perhaps is scarcely worth saying. It is too obvious and undisputed. Even his enemies acknowledge his eminent abilities and pay the tribute of resentment to the unbending rectitude of his character. In a world of practical politics the men who rule national conventions ask about availability. What are Mr. Hughes's powers as a vote getter? How can he be nominated without the possession of a political machine? The answer to both questions is in his past campaigns. He has never sought an office. He has always been drafted because the politicians found their party needed him. His first nomination, that for Mayor of New York, was made by a convention that hoped to use his prestige as an insurance investigator to defeat Tammany, but he refused to let that work, then under way, be dragged into politics. He did not seek the Governorship, but was nominated because party leaders considered him the strongest candidate they could find, and popular confidence in him was such that he was elected when every other candidate with him on the State ticket was defeated. Two years later, the political bosses whom he had antagonized, because he took seriously his pledges of independence, thought all was fixed to put him on the shelf; but, though they controlled the State Convention, they did not dare burden the national campaign in other States as well as New York with the odium of rejecting him. He not only won the election for himself by an increased plurality, despite the disaffection of some politicians and of the sporting element in the Republican cities, but his aid of Mr. Taft was one of the noteworthy features of that campaign. His speech at Youngstown, Ohio, was the most powerful argument made during the whole struggle, and its merciless analysis of Mr. Bryan's anti-trust and banking proposals, which had a specious appeal and were the particular pride of the Nebraskan, was so completely demolishing that nothing more was heard of them from the Democrats.

Again, in 1916, party leaders, including some in New York, despite their grievances over encounters with an independent

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Governor, turned to him as the man best fitted to heal the division created in 1912. True, he was defeated, but he polled 928,000 more votes than were cast for Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Taft together in 1912, and 859,000 more votes than were cast by a united and triumphant party for Mr. Taft in 1908. He was defeated through no failure or fault of his own, but by conditions beyond control. No possible campaign of his could counteract the effect of the Wilson cry: "He kept us out of war!" Even Mr. Roosevelt's great popularity in the West, where he spoke in that campaign, could not convince the voters that they had any responsibility in Europe. The Republicans lost Kansas because the issues of the war were dimly perceived there, and the Republican farmers, prosperous from the demand for their produce, were persuaded that nothing would induce Mr. Wilson to enter the struggle. The Democrats had the advantage of posing as guardians of prosperity and peace, while the Republicans were handicapped by the fear that their victory meant war. Mr. Hughes was criticized for excessive moderation by ardent Pro-Allies in the East, but aside from political expediency, no man with a sense of patriotism would enter the White House, even if he could, committed by his campaign to foreign partisanship. Despite that difficulty, he carried the East by impressive majorities.

He faced an impossible situation with a large part of the country still under the spell of Mr. Wilson's soon-to-be-abandoned pacifism. And yet he almost won. He lost California and the election solely because the "Old Guard" leaders in that State did not keep their pledges not to let faction interfere with the national campaign, but tried to use Mr. Hughes and his visit there as an asset in their fight in the Senatorial primary against Hiram Johnson, by parading themselves as the exclusive friends of the candidate. Mr. Hughes sought to show every courtesy to Mr. Johnson, but before the slights to the latter's friends by the machine managers were discovered, the impression had been created that determined them to make Mr. Johnson's victory emphatic by contrast with the vote for the national ticket.

The prejudice against running a defeated candidate is pure superstition. It if had been regarded, Grover Cleveland would

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

never have been President a second time, and Alfred E. Smith would not have been restored to the Governor's chair and put on the road to a Presidential nomination. Mr. Hughes's prestige today is far greater than it was in 1916. He is wiser, he has mingled more with men, he has outlived many old antagonisms, he has dealt more with large affairs. He has become not only a national, but a world, personality. And he is probably the only Republican, except President Coolidge, who can be looked to with confidence to carry New York against Governor Smith.

He has never lost the State, but every time he has gone before its people they have given him increased pluralities. In 1916 he had 119,800 plurality, while the best Governor Smith has done in a Presidential year, when the rural Republican vote comes out, was 108,000, in 1924. In 1920 Mr. Smith lost the State by 74,000. Even his off-year pluralities of 385,000 in 1922, and 247,000 in 1926, do not appear so remarkable when the greater ease of getting out the city vote at such times and the fact that the electorate has been almost doubled by woman suffrage, thus tending to double old time pluralities, are considered. The suggestion of friends of some Western candidates that New York is not needed for Republican victory, is a counsel of temerity. However reluctant Southern Democrats may be to vote for Governor Smith, it is chimerical to suppose that he would lose any one of the Southern States, with the possible exception of Kentucky and Tennessee, and he would be strong in New Jersey and Massachusetts. Mr. Hughes would be stronger than any Republican mentioned to succeed Mr. Coolidge in the East, and, pitted against Governor Smith and the sidewalks of New York, would need to fear no defections in the West.

If, when the National Convention meets, the Republicans as in 1920 foresee certain victory, they are likely to do as they did then, pick some favorite son in a midnight conference. But if, as now seems probable, they face a hard and doubtful campaign against a candidate who inspires enthusiasm and is thought of by thousands of the plain people as one of themselves, the problem, even for friends of other men will be: Can they get on without Mr. Hughes?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

GOVERNOR ALBERT C. RITCHIE

BY THE HON. WILLIAM CABELL BRUCE

AMONG the Democrats who have acquired a national reputation, and are generally regarded as being highly qualified for the office of President, Governor Albert C. Ritchie, of Maryland, is one of the most conspicuous. When the last National Democratic Convention was held in the city of New York, he had, even then, become sufficiently well known to the people of the United States, as a candidate for the Presidency, to be an object of not a little public curiosity and comment, because of his admirable record as Governor of Maryland, his timely and eloquent utterances touching the extent to which Federal encroachment had invaded the principle of personal liberty and eaten into the core of State authority, and the winning nature of his personal and social characteristics. Since that time, he has grown steadily, in point of National prominence and influence; so much so that it can, perhaps, be truly said that, with the single exception of Governor Alfred E. Smith, of New York, no other Democrat is now deemed so likely to be nominated by the next National Democratic Convention as he. One by one, he has been brought into personal contact with most of the National Democratic leaders, and, in many of the great populous centers of the country, in response to invitations from highly responsible sources, his voice has been heard; insisting, in singularly clear and persuasive accents, upon the Reserved Rights of the States, and the immunity to which the citizen is justly entitled against undue interference with his personal and business freedom by Governmental authority. If Governor Smith, as now seems not unlikely, shall come into the next Democratic convention with sufficient strength to secure the votes of two-thirds of its delegates, Governor Ritchie, of course, will not be nominated, but will, as his recent utterances have clearly disclosed, give his unstinted support to the nominee. Nor will he be nominated,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

should the choice of that convention fall upon some "dry" candidate, or some candidate who has no record, one way or the other, in relation to the issues that have given Governor Ritchie his place in the public eye. But should Governor Smith, for one reason or another, not receive the nomination, and should the convention decide not to ignore political questions that everybody is thinking about for political questions that nobody is thinking about, Governor Ritchie, as things now stand, would seem to be the most eligible candidate for the Presidency that the Democratic Party could select.

The reasons for this view can be briefly stated:

He has the abilities, native and acquired, that the office of President calls for. An A.B. of the Johns Hopkins University, a thoroughly educated and trained lawyer, he possesses all the mental culture and discipline that even the most exacting responsibilities require. He early acquired a partnership interest in the business of one of the leading law firms of Baltimore, and, afterward, as a general practitioner, as a Deputy City Solicitor of the Baltimore Law Department, as the People's Counsel of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, and as Attorney-General of Maryland, he established a reputation for sound legal knowledge and powers of statement, analysis and reasoning which leave but little room for doubt that, if he had not allowed himself to be drawn off into the wider field of general politics, he would have won a reputation as a lawyer as solid and brilliant as that which he has won as a public man. Indeed, it was the very able and successful manner in which, as People's Counsel, he represented the People of Maryland in one of the first great rate cases decided by the Public Service Commission of Maryland, that led to his election as Attorney-General.

Repeatedly, in American history, the office of Governor has proved a stepping stone to the Presidency; and this is natural enough; for the duties of the two offices are generically alike. As the Chief Magistrate of Maryland, Governor Ritchie has exhibited a remarkable degree of executive capacity. Locking the door of his professional office behind him, and throwing away the key, when he first became Governor, he has, from that day to this, except when yielding to an occasional demand from

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

some great city for his views on the Federal questions of the hour, addressed himself with absolutely single-minded devotion to the duties of his public office. It is safe to say that no Governor of Maryland has ever had a more thorough knowledge of every part of its surface, or a more complete mastery of all its administrative activities. His tact, his mental balance, his keen, practical insight into human motives, have won for him a signal measure of success in reconciling party conflicts, and keeping on good working terms with the leaders and other members of the Maryland Legislature. It is not too much to say that his tireless labors and enlightened spirit have made themselves felt in every branch, great or small, of the Maryland State administration. They have produced strikingly constructive results in the field of State taxation, in the Civil Service of the State, now happily crowned, through his initiative, with the merit system of appointment, in the management of the roads and public schools of the State, and in the purchase of State supplies. They have also borne good fruit in legislation relating to coöperative marketing, the eradication of dairy herd tuberculosis and other matters of concern to the welfare of the farmer; and in legislation promotive of the health and safety of the miner. When he was reëlected in 1923, after completing his first term, it was by a plurality of more than 40,000 votes. When he was reëlected in 1926, after completing his second term, it was by a majority of 61,000 votes—the greatest majority that any candidate for the Governorship has ever received in the history of Maryland. Governors have been elected in Maryland by the popular suffrage since 1838; but he is the only individual who has ever been honored by the people of Maryland with a reëlection to the office. Facts like these, in themselves, indicate the calibre and public worth of the man as no amount of verbal eulogy could ever do.

Since his first election to his present office, Governor Ritchie has become the foremost champion in the Democratic party of those principles of individual freedom, business independence and local self-government which have, since our Civil War, been so gravely violated by the steady centralization of authority in the Federal Government, worked by Congressional legislation, judicial interpretation, and Constitutional amendment. This

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

process has gone on until Governor Ritchie could truly say, in his luminous address at the Jackson Day dinner of the Iroquois Club, at Chicago, last year: "The effect of all this is that, slowly but steadily, by this Federal supervision over roads, agriculture, health, education, infant hygiene, motherhood and what not, the liberty of the State and of the individual becomes impaired, and the Federal Government shapes the development and the policy of the States, and shapes them not to fit the States' own peculiar needs, but to fit some uniform Federal idea that emanates from Washington." By no one, in the recent history of the United States, has the application of the old Jeffersonian philosophy—the soundest that ever animated the energies of a people—to the present problems of our political life been so consistently and forcefully made as by Governor Ritchie. One by one, his public addresses, marked by deep reflection, close familiarity with the letter and spirit of our American institutions, and every token of clear and convincing exposition and argument, have pointed out the evil results which have flowed from the increasing Federal hypertrophy, and the increasing local atrophy, produced by shifting the regulation of personal liberty and matters of domestic import from the States to the General Government. The loss of personal and industrial freedom, the decline of individual initiative and enterprise, the multiplication of Federal Bureaus and Commissions far removed from the healthful and quickening influence of local sentiments and activities, the decadence of the local unit as a nursery of civic enthusiasm and a training school for statesmanship, the injustice of applying rigidly uniform standards of administration to forty-eight States, widely separated from each other in point of historic antecedents and traditions, social customs, usages and habits, the deadening influence of Federal autocracy upon the free play of political ideas and movements—all these morbid sequels of Federal expansion have, at one time or another, been brought out by Governor Ritchie, in the course of his public speeches, in such a manner as to make him, though the Governor of one of the smaller States of the Union, better known to the people of the United States than any Governor now living, except Alfred E. Smith.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

With his political creed, it was impossible, of course, that Governor Ritchie should not be particularly hostile to the fifty-fifty system of Federal and State appropriations, by which the Federal Government, in the guise of benevolent paternalism, has succeeded in balancing the selfish interests of some of the States against the just rights of others, and depriving all the States of autonomous control over some of the most intimate concerns of their corporate life. "By fifty-fifty subsidies from the Federal Treasury," he said in a recent speech at Boston, "we are slowly surrendering our State Autonomy and administrative efficiency and independence; just as by constantly looking to the same Treasury for Federal uplift expenditures, in the States, we are submitting to Federal favoritism through a species of log-rolling bribery that is unworthy of us, and is undermining the independence and integrity of the States."

With his political creed, it was equally impossible for Governor Ritchie not to be especially inimical to the system of National Prohibition, which has so unwisely and tyrannically invaded the province of human liberty, and prescribed exactly the same rule of conduct for the social life of the wealthiest and most luxurious city, in the United States, as for the social life of the simplest countryside, within its borders. Speaking of National Prohibition, in the same speech from which I have just quoted, he said: "National Prohibition under the Eighteenth Amendment has bred more interstate discord and more political cowards and hypocrites, and has done more damage to the body politic and to our social fabric, than anything which, in my observation at least, has ever entered our national life. That is because you cannot regulate personal conduct and practices, which differ in different localities of a varied country, with a Federal yardstick; applying a uniform standard everywhere."

It is to be hoped that the next Democratic National Convention will be judicious enough to realize that, in Governor Ritchie, the Democratic Party has at least one man in its ranks, in addition to Alfred E. Smith, of New York, who, if nominated to the Presidency, would have bright prospects of election. In the prime of life, handsome in appearance, and engaging in manners and address, he would win favor in the popular eye whithersoever

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

he might go during the Presidential contest. Born in Virginia, a life-long resident of Maryland, sprung, on both the paternal and maternal side, from family stocks noted for intellectual superiority and public usefulness, he would stand out from our National background as few nominees to the Presidency have done. An Episcopalian, but as popular with Catholic and Jew in Maryland as with Protestant, noteworthy for his just treatment of the Negro in educational and other respects, his nomination would, in itself, be a silent rebuke to sectarian bigotry and racial bitterness. Endowed with fine powers as a writer and speaker, his thoughts and purposes as a candidate would be set forth with a degree of effective clearness that would leave little to be desired. An earnest advocate of the restoration of liquor control, subject to the limitations of the Eighteenth Amendment, to the several States, he would bring to the Democratic standard far more than enough Republicans, disgusted with the lawlessness, political corruption and bloodshed begotten by National Prohibition, to offset any Prohibitionist defection in the Democratic ranks. The foremost protagonist of the Democracy of Jefferson and Cleveland, his election would be a home-coming event of extraordinary significance in a party sense. The holder of a responsible post, under the Wilson Administration, during the World War, and a loyal adherent of Woodrow Wilson himself, he would make an especially strong appeal to all those Democrats who hold the name of that great man in reverence. Sane, firmly poised, without an eccentric streak in his character, sharing all the conservative attributes of the people of Maryland, a State in which there are many wealthy men and not a few vast industries, but no "malefactors of great wealth", the business interests of the country could confidently look to him for sound policies of finance and taxation. Irreproachably faithful, throughout his entire political career, to the general popular welfare, "equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever State or persuasion, religious or political," would be his watchword as it was that of the great Democratic leaders in times past.

To sum up, Governor Ritchie would be a President worthy, in every respect, to fill the exalted office which has exercised such a powerful influence in shaping our destinies as a people.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE DIVIDED HOUSE OF RUSSIA

BY COUNT SFORZA

In Russia, the least important thing is the Government. The really essential factors are the workmen and the peasants. It is with them that one has to reckon, much more than with the Kremlin. But dictatorial governments always excite some curiosity, be they exercised by a small clique or by a single demagogic individual. We may then well examine what is now the Russian Government and what it stands for.

I

When one has enough mental serenity not to be biased by mere appearances and theoretical formulas, he can see that the present régime is simply a copy and continuation of the Czarist rule, with a little more disorder, comprehensible after such an upheaval. The present régime, which is not in the least to be confounded with Lenin's epoch, is controlled by a group whose chief is Mr. Stalin, a Georgian. The most important among his colleagues are Mr. Rykow and Mr. Bukarin. These gentlemen probably believe themselves to be most sincere Bolsheviki; but they are without the terrible gift of fixed ideas which made the real force of a Lenin or of a Trotzky. They are shrewd people. They believe that the Revolution has to be defended by an iron discipline imposing silence upon all members of their party and making them obey their chiefs *perinde ac cadaver*, as probably they would like to say, if they knew the rules that Loyola dictated for his Jesuits. Only they believe also, probably in good faith, that the Revolution consists essentially in the permanence of their very persons at the Kremlin.

No elections, not even inside the assemblies of the party, although it constitutes the smallest possible minority of the Russian people; no freedom of the press; no criticisms are allowed during the rare meetings of the party. Everything is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ruled by a small class of bureaucrats and of party officials, all selected from above, by Mr. Stalin himself, or in Mr. Stalin's name. Anybody who, having known a little of old imperial Russia, goes there again now, finds the same atmosphere of bureaucratic tyranny, of espionage, of fear—of mental suffocation, in a word.

But political passions, be they conservative or revolutionary, have rendered it so difficult to bear a serene judgment on the Russian situation, or to believe that a judgment is really serene, that it is better to let the Bolsheviki speak for themselves, which they rarely do.

Only a few months ago one of them dared to say at the Communist Federal Congress: "Among those who govern, many believe, and nothing has yet disillusioned them, that they are above all existing law, that they will never be punished, whatever they do."

Mr. Kalinin himself, although he belongs to the present all powerful group, went so far, a few months ago, as to write: "In old Russia there was no legal status for the masses; the nobles and the capitalists were always sure not to be punished; the officials were the tyrants of their subordinates. This continued for centuries. The national idea of justice came out in the end, breaking a world where the strong were always right and the feeble were always wrong. It is only too natural that the respect of the laws and of justice is not yet rooted in the people's hearts. The new law was there: but life still went on as before. We must confess that we have made no serious progress since Czarist times."

No doubt, there is something in Mr. Kalinin's excuses and defenses. All the same, they constitute a poorly veiled acknowledgment of the failure of ten years of Bolshevik rule.

The old imperial bureaucracy, corrupt and cumbersome as it frequently was, possessed a sort of moral force, the natural outcome of routine and tradition; always slow though it was, it happened sometimes to be honest and intellectual when represented by some rare but highly respectable types of the Russian *intelligencia*. Yet no boasts of perfection came out of the ranks of the ancient officials, but rather the contrary. The young

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Communist bureaucracy, however, is always putting on pretentious and busy airs; with a conceited smile it is always shouting that a new world is about to come out of its ideas. In reality, as soon as the new comers are confronted with any difficulty, they hide badly—behind a mask of Napoleonic decision—the most childish incapacity and uncertainty. The fact that the new régime pretends and proclaims to be constantly infallible makes the effect of incompetence and ignorance so much the worse.

An official of the imperial epoch remained for years in the same employ and in the same town; even if incompetent, he ended sometimes by acquiring some sort of rough businesslike practice. The pretentious young agents from the Soviet Kremlin are not allowed to be laughed at; they may only be hated or feared. As soon as the grumbling and complaints from villages and towns grow to the point of disregarding the fear of governmental displeasure, and threaten to become a source of wider scandal, an immediate change of place and employment is ordered from Moscow. Frequently the change takes the form of a promotion, because the Soviet agents cannot be wrong. Through the whole extent of Russia, from the Pacific province to the Polish frontier, there is an eternal movement of officials in search of virgin places in which to show their talents.

So, through lack of men, through lack of courage and of free discussion, through lack of a sufficiently long and conscious evolution in the masses, the great dream Lenin dreamed, when he transplanted the Russian Government from Petrograd to Moscow, has been shattered. The fall is even worse than it would have been if anarchy had come. Anarchy, indeed, is an essentially provisional condition, out of which something new must come. The new Russian Government has simply sunk to the worst forms and traditions of that Czarist bureaucracy which Lenin felt sure he could replace by a more living and efficient Russia.

How could it have been otherwise, when the two régimes had in common the same hate and mistrust for individual freedom and for any fecund open struggle of ideas; for all that, in a word, which alone makes social life worth the living?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

II

What are the relations between the masses of Russian workmen and the Soviet Government?

The Russian workmen constitute a maximum of fifteen millions in a total of one hundred and thirty million Russians, the remainder practically now all peasants. The Communist party, which had no more than thirty thousand members when, in 1917, it succeeded in seizing the power, has grown to 800,000 members. Indeed it might have increased to millions, when one thinks that, in Russia, it is only by the fact of being a member of the Communist party that one may have a complete sense of personal safety. They are, in the party, still under one million, not because of lack of applications for membership, but out of traditional respect for Lenin's formula prescribing "quality, not quantity". Be the quality good or bad in a Communistic sense, the fact is that admissions into the Party are still relatively slow. Of the 800,000 members of the Communist Party, only about 350,000 are workmen or ex-workmen, the other 450,000 being ex-bourgeois, assumed workmen and, in the lowest proportion, peasants.

There are books and newspapers in Europe and America that describe the privations and sufferings of the Russian workmen. The description is exact, the coloring is not overdone; all the same a polemical aim soon appears to the eyes of the few who know, when not a word is found about the real moral feeling of these workmen—a feeling which is still, in spite of privations and sufferings, a sort of religious unshaken faith in Communism. We may add, in parenthesis, that, by voluntary omissions of this kind, those writings often reach an effect contrary to their aims, by provoking, even in the spirit of some anti-Bolshevik but free Russian spirits, a sense of mental and moral dislike for the Western methods of polemical campaign against Communism. When, voluntarily or not, one disregards certain psychological sides of the race, nothing is to be understood in Russia.

Let us state the truth as it is.

The Russian workmen deeply believe—or, to be more cautious, till now they still believe, in spite of a series of deceitful years—

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that the Leninist formula "proletariat dictatorship" is the key to the enchanting world of their hopes.

This formula they find repeated everywhere they go, in a hundred different forms. At the evening meetings, at the new free open air theatres, at the movies, they are constantly lulled by the same refrain:—Is it not the Russian proletariat alone, that rules the destinies of a great country? Where on the earth, except here in Russia, do bourgeois and ex-bourgeois tremble and bow before a real workman? Where, out of Russia, are imperial palaces turned into homes for old workmen? Where, if not towards Communist Russia, do all the working classes in the world turn their hopes and their deepest aspirations?

The Russian workmen do not seem tired of such courtly flattery. And, like the guests of the imperial villas in the Crimea now converted into rest-houses for old proletarians, they readily believe the pleasant lullaby. They do not deny that today they are suffering; but they tighten their belts and hope that tomorrow, or the day after tomorrow, everything will turn out all right.

There is—and those who are unable to see it are to be pitied—some moral nobility in their thinking and saying, as they often do, that it is for their sons that they wait, that it is their sons who will be happy and free on this earth.

Probably analogous delusions, if in a much lesser proportion, are momentarily to be witnessed in any other country where a dictatorial power has, as in Russia, suppressed all liberty of the press, where the formulas of the governing group are exclusively advertised and preached. But the mystic nature of the Russian soul reaches, with its longing for sufferance, a degree of sincerity not to be found elsewhere. It is with a sort of religious ardor that the working classes of Leningrad and Moscow believe themselves to be the vanguards of a new world, of a happier humanity. When they suffer, they find some consolation in thinking that, by what they are enduring, they advance the blessed day of universal happiness—the happiness of all the slaves and pariahs of Europe and Asia.

It is in this mentality of the only sure forces the Revolution still counts in Russia, that one has chiefly to find the real source

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and cause of so many intrigues and plots, sometimes silly and sometimes well concocted, with which the Soviet Government has created or helped agitations and movements in different countries. All the Kremlin schemings for Communistic propaganda abroad, from England to China, had probably a paramount reason in the necessity of the Bolshevik leaders to give some food, some hope, some satisfaction to the religiously fanatic troops of the Russian working world.

All this propaganda brought on grave complications and humiliations, such as the London perquisitions and the violation of the Soviet Embassy in Peking, or, even worse, the murder of the Russian Minister in Warsaw, followed by an exceedingly mild sentence on the murderer. At the Kremlin they were shrewd enough to foresee all these complications: but they were obliged to get into trouble, in order to satisfy the workmen. To satisfy them fully, the Russian Government would have found itself bound, when faced by cases like the Peking violation of diplomatic privileges, to formulate menaces, to pretend reparations. But nothing of the kind has been done. If some strong note has been sent, for instance to Warsaw, it was simply meant for home consumption. For the same purpose have all the fine phrases been concocted in the Moscow press, to show how and why Russia is "too proud to fight".

The real truth lies in a contradictory force that opposes the workmen and that makes the Russian Government, placed between the two, feeble and uncertain; it is because of this hidden force that the Bolshevik political bombast is so frequently followed by sudden retreats.

This powerful element, so antithetic to the workmen, is—the peasants.

III

The peasants were Communist after the Revolution; even, to be more exact, they seemed Communist when their object was to drive the old proprietors out of their estates. It was the repetition of what has frequently taken place in the peasant movements, in so many countries, from ancient revolts of peasants in China to the *Jacqueries* of royalist France. The phenomenon

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

seemed more formidable in Russia, only because the peasants' movement identified itself, in time and manner, with Lenin's *coup*. In truth—and it is a point whose meaning has no scanty importance, to understand the Russian Revolution—the Russian peasant had already begun to seize the lands and to slay his old *barin*—who sometimes was slain and mourned in the same instant—even before he had heard a single word about Communism and Bolshevism. When Lenin caught hold of power, he simply formulated in words what the peasants had already created in deeds. This is why the peasants supported Lenin, but without giving any serious attention to his words.

The same phenomenon took place when they victoriously opposed the Wrangel and Denikin expeditions. They did not obey Moscow orders so much as they did their own instinct, which warned them against the young White officers, the sons of the landowners they had suppressed and slain some months before.

On the morrow of the Great War, I was in Constantinople as High Commissioner for Italy. As soon as the Italian officers attached to the General Staff of the White Army in the Crimea reported to me that many of the Russian officers organized small raids upon their former properties, to take them away from the sons of their old serfs, I realized at once that the White Russian expeditions, already morally suspect to many of the Russian *intelligencia* because financed with British and French money, were doomed to a complete failure.

But Lenin also had his big failure with the peasants. Thinking to be really all powerful, he said in a speech in the first weeks of 1919:

> The peasants ask freedom to sell their grain. This freedom means also the freedom to speculate. Do they not understand that it is impossible for us to allow that? We shall never agree: we will rather die than yield on this essential point.

The peasants said, or, rather, thought, in their turn: "The land is ours, but the grain is yours; the meadows are ours, but the hay is yours." They acted accordingly. The result was the terrible famine of 1920 and 1921, due to the fact that hardly half the Russian soil had been cultivated.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Lenin had sworn to die rather than to yield. He finally preferred to yield without dying.

Since then the Russian peasants have constantly increased their force. The taxation system has been changed to meet their fancies. They have been left proprietors of their houses. The land division has been made according to rules that, under new pompous revolutionary names, are but ancient Russian traditions. It is for the peasants that the *Nep* has been created, the *Nep* that makes it possible for them to buy the articles they need. When they did not find them, as happened two years ago, they carried back their grain, and so provoked a dangerous crisis. They even became rich: the *kulak* (literally, "closed fist") is already to be found in almost every village; and the *kulak* is nothing other than the shrewd peasant who is already hiring cheap labor to work his fields, who has already got an account at the bank of the near-by town.

Last, but not least, it is the peasants who have compelled the abolition of requisitions in kind, and the restoration of commercial freedom.

Now that he finds himself master of the land, the peasant is—naturally—much more of a Conservative than anything else. The same happened in France, when the *paysans* became, with the Revolution, the proprietors of the *Biens Nationaux*.

The Moscow theorists bow prudently to this new reality, unpleasant as it is for their dogmas. Recently the *Pravda* explained, with some *distinguo*, not unworthy of the finest traditions of the Jesuits, that a peasant does still remain "a good member of the Communistic proletariat", even when he employs a dozen "temporary" workmen, during harvest time.

Other Communists go further, and, at least with more intellectual honesty, they admit that the creation of a class of well-off peasants must be favored, as it may constitute the economic backbone of Russia. All right. But Stolypin, the last of the great statesmen of Imperial Russia, who in his efforts to save Emperor and Empire was always hindered by Nicholas II, never said anything else, and did not try to get at anything different. Only the "pure" grumble. Mr. Trotzky, who was once Menshevik, and, since he is out of power, has become a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fanatic of Communistic intransigeance against Mr. Stalin's rough empiricism, published some months ago a declaration in which one finds passages like the following:

> A Socialistic government has as one of its very first problems the task of leading the poor out of their hopeless situation. A lack of means in that very Socialist government makes impossible a sudden change, but it does not give us the right to shut our eyes to the actual situation and feed the poor with moral lessons on the psychology of extravagance, at the same time encouraging the *kulaks*.

Should Mr. Trotzky come again tomorrow into power, he would probably end by recognizing that from the depth of the Russian peasant masses a sort of bourgeoisie is slowly coming to the surface, a bourgeoisie which will end by resembling the old one, with this difference, perhaps: that it will hate and distrust the old monarchical forms, as it happened and happens with the French peasants, and very much for the same reasons. Mr. Trotzky would probably recognize, at the same time, that certain industrial concerns, to serve the peasants, have been started again, and contain an embryo of bourgeoisie.

It may be that the "pure" of the Bolshevism would be able, if again in power, to wipe away the newly arisen industrial concerns. They would be powerless before the thoughts, the feelings, the will of ninety per cent. of the Russian population.

To please the workmen, the leaders of Soviet Russia are bound to make a show of propagandist zeal abroad, in Europe and in Asia. Fiercely opposed in China, in Indo-China, in India, they have created a bureau at Mecca, to influence there, far from any western agent, the hundred of thousands of Moslem pilgrims. They will start still new devices, that will probably, all of them, result in nothing else than new embarrassments and humiliations for Mr. Tchicherin.

It is the existence of the two opposing forces in Russian life that imposes upon the new régime the fatal contradiction which so frequently characterizes its action. For the workmen, who deeply and naïvely believe in universal revolution, the Kremlin men are obliged to scheme and act, although they know, at the bottom of their hearts, of how little use it is, and how dangerous. For the peasants, a seemingly passive and silent mass, but, when

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it really matters, all powerful, the Kremlin men are bound to submit to any humiliation; because those real masters do not want to hear of diplomatic complications, of mobilization, of wars.

The peasants would not endure being again called to arms. They would not expressly think of overthrowing the Kremlin men; but a simple heavy elbow push would probably be sufficient to provoke one of those changes that reactionary schemings from abroad were always and will always be unable to bring about.

One may go even further. It is to be believed that the various military actions of yesterday, the diplomatic ones of today, far from creating real dangers for the Russian régime, do simply, in a certain sense, strengthen it. For my part, I declared this publicly when, being at the direction of the Italian foreign policy, I was approached to obtain Italian collaboration in some foolish anti-Bolshevik action from outside. The attacks from outside succeeded only in making Russian solidarity stronger. This was certainly true when the London and Paris Cabinets supported Kolchak, Denikin and Wrangel. It is equally true, if only in a lesser degree, concerning certain recent diplomatic moves. The internal Russian struggle between Mr. Stalin and the other men now in power on one side, and the opposition led by Mr. Trotzky on the other, had reached a critical stage, just when the British Cabinet proceeded to the rather empty perquisitions in London and, after that, to the severance of diplomatic relations. Lenin's widow was at once put on the scene. With pathetic speeches, in a voice broken by emotion, she showed the enemies as already at Russia's doors. All opposition was quelled; a new union was sworn in, or, at least, a long armistice, among the violent opponents of the day before.

Truly, when one hears of any common anti-Bolshevik plan, as we do now on reading certain English Conservative newspapers, one is almost tempted to remember the classical *salus ab inimicis;* indeed no better service could be rendered to Moscow.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PROGRESS THROUGH BIRTH CONTROL

BY CHARLOTTE PERKINS GILMAN

MINDS large enough to consider society as a whole were long ago impressed by the rate of increase in population and its effect on human happiness. From Plato and Aristotle to Franklin, Hume and Wallace, men have studied the matter, coming to various rather sad conclusions. The authority most commonly associated with the subject is Malthus, that scholarly English humanitarian, whose valuable work is, as so often happens, widely misunderstood. As an earnest young man discussing with his father the possibility of human improvement, he was impressed by the relation of the rapidly accumulating population to its means of subsistence, finding that the first tends to increase in geometrical and the second in arithmetical ratio.

On the conservative estimate that population tends to double itself every twenty-five years, while even the most intensive agriculture can not maintain such a rate, it becomes evident that increasing misery must accompany an unchecked birth rate. The checks listed by Mr. Malthus are preventive and positive; the preventive, "either moral restraint or vice, always so pernicious to society;" the positive, all the evil conditions of poverty and disease, with war, pestilence and famine.

"The Malthusian doctrine," as it was called, was heartily condemned by the Fundamentalists of the day as subversive of the Divine command to "increase and multiply and replenish the earth", and as leading to impious practices. Regarding the latter Mr. Malthus is by no means to be credited with advocacy of the various prudential checks so often associated with his name. The single precept advanced by him is this: "Do not marry until you have a fair prospect of supporting a family." In our century the matter is taken up again from a quite different standpoint by a woman, on strictly feminist grounds. Margaret Sanger's demand is for the protection of women, especially of the working

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

class, from undesired and undesirable motherhood. Quite unconvinced of the efficacy of Mr. Malthus's moral appeal, she recommends practical methods of prevention, and these simple devices are by no means limited to the use of oppressed wives.

So many people today, married and unmarried, seriously advocate as "the natural life" a degree of sex indulgence without parallel in nature that they are eagerly willing to use unnatural methods to avoid the natural results. It is mainly this phase of the birth control movement which brings upon it wide condemnation and the attempted suppression of its message. Yet the matter is of such vital importance to society that it commands growing attention, and is being studied from widely different angles. The recent international conference held in New York to discuss the question was attended by delegates from many countries, serious thinkers in varying lines.

There is widening interest among physicians, who see so much of the pathological results of too much childbearing, not only on the worn out mother and the father struggling to maintain his family, but also on the children, who cannot be well endowed by exhausted parents. Dr. Alfred Ploetz, of Munich, has made a careful study in this field, finding that the mortality of the first nine children varies little, but that "from the tenth to the nineteenth the mortality is markedly greater".

Among economists the limitation of the birth rate is held important, not only in relation to agricultural increase, but, as sharply, in competition for wages, and in the dysgenesic effects of a low grade of living. Eugenists plainly show the deterioration of stock from careless and excessive breeding, and urge a higher standard of parenthood. It has already been shown in Holland that a restricted birth rate is accompanied by a declining death rate, so that to a considerable extent quality can be improved without loss in quantity.

But it is restriction in quantity which is necessary if we are ever to enjoy permanent peace. We search profoundly for the cause or causes of war, and are beginning to see that one continuing, unescapable cause is babies, too many babies. Some twenty years ago a German seriously stated to me that Germany must have more land on account of her birth rate. I asked him if he

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

held that the surface of the earth should be divided among the peoples in proportion to their fecundity. He bethought him of the Russian birth rate, the Chinese birth rate, the African birth rate, and was silent.

Unquestionably "the pressure of population" is a basic and permanent cause of war. A given piece of country will support a certain number of people. When the people exceed that number they must live miserably and die in wretchedness, or go somewhere else.

This going somewhere else is the earliest and still most approved method of relieving that "pressure of population". From the remotest past the hungry hordes have sought more hunting grounds or fishing grounds or farming grounds, and if these were already occupied there was war, always war. When the second half of the world became accessible it gave vast relief. Here was room enough, surely. The previous possessors were superseded and Europe poured her surplus, especially, when possible, her undesirable surplus, upon the new continents. These were large, immigration was welcomed by the earlier comers, and for a while the pressure was relieved.

But even with a country the size of ours a little computation shows how short a time will fill it thicker than Belgium, which has 658 persons to the square mile, to our present thirty-five. We increased, from 1820 to 1920, from 6,638,453, to 105,710,620. In another century at this rate we shall have about 1,691,289,920, which is 560 to the square mile; in 2120 there will be 8,960 to the square mile, which is about 16 to the acre. In 2220, 256 to the acre, or about nineteen square yards apiece; and in 2320, 4,096 to the acre, giving hardly room to be buried in.

Even if we could be fed, life looks somewhat undesirable where there is standing room only. The above figures are based on the usual estimate that the population doubles every twenty-five years, and our last century shows that we have practically done this. Moreover medical science is steadily reducing our death rate, so that even if we limit immigration we shall still tend to increase at the average rate of sixteen fold in a century.

Four hundred years is not enough to strain our vision. We are quite accustomed to grasping long periods of time—if it is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

behind us. We delight in studying the records of our remotest past, not only in historic limits but in the archæologic relics long previous; and back of that the geologic story of dim ages gone, with astronomic æons immeasurable. But to look ahead a few centuries and plan to arrange the world in better working order seems beyond us. The few scattered thinkers who have faced the future with a view to its betterment we call "Utopians". Yet knowledge of the past is only useful as it affects the future, and the future is the only period we can influence.

Rightly to evaluate any proposed measure affecting the interests of the human race requires definite knowledge of the nature and purpose of that race. We persist in looking at human life as an individual affair, and in holding that our highest duty in this world is preparing to go to another. Yet while passionately interested in our theoretical future in another world, we completely ignore the practical future of this one.

This may be somewhat due to the fact that to attain happiness in another world we need only to believe something, while to secure it in this world we must needs do something. The exhortations of the pulpit have sought to stimulate intense interest in our personal prospects of future life after death, but there is scant recognition of our common responsibility for the future life of our descendants on earth.

As a matter of fact man is the only animal able consciously to assist his own development. Since we mastered our food supply we have entered upon that later stage of progress called social evolution, but have only begun to be conscious of this process and of our own capacity to promote it. When so intelligently conscious we shall measure social conditions as they advance or retard human progress, our first duty.

The limitation of population is a proposition to be so measured. Unlimited, as heretofore, it has gone on swelling to the closest margin of subsistence, as in China; boiling over in conquest and colonization, as with any people able to take possession of some one else's country; or, as now, still boiling over and insisting that the more thinly settled countries shall admit in peaceable invasion the unchecked increase of the crowded ones.

It is a mere matter of arithmetic to show how soon this means

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the saturation point for all countries, and not only that but a mixture of peoples obliterating all the slow-built distinction of races from which have arisen the special gifts of each to the world's progress.

If the Jewish people had freely mixed with all their Semitic brethren, the Hittites and the Hivites, and Jebusites and Perrizites and Amalekites and the rest, there would hardly have appeared the distinctive religious passion and ethical enthusiasm of the Peculiar People. If ancient Greece had mixed with Semites, Persians, Egyptians and northern barbarians, the wonders of Greek art could not have illuminated the world.

It is of course conceivable to have conquest without mixture, by maintaining a rigid caste system, as in India, but the results of this method are not promising. So we are faced with a choice of three courses: Shall we allow the unchecked increase of population, with peaceful overflow, till all countries are equally crowded and all peoples are either mixed, or stratified in castes? Shall we allow that unchecked increase and fight continually for our places in the sun? Or shall we keep the population within rationally chosen limits?

The reason that this question has not forced itself upon public attention before is that until lately there was no general objection to war. It was known that some races were stronger than others, and assumed quite rightly that the stronger should conquer the weaker and exterminate, disperse or enslave the conquered. This was certainly a "natural" process, following the precedent of all previous life forms.

But when we observe that a conquering people is not necessarily superior to the conquered, and that social progress has been most seriously retarded by the destruction of more advanced societies by the less so, this primitive process of selection seems quite unsatisfactory.

Moreover in the past, when we were even more ignorant than now, there was much beside war to keep down the population. Famine destroyed its millions; occasional pestilence and continual disease did as well; and the internal economic pressure of population kept a painful balance between birth and death. In England, after the Great Plague, the working class enjoyed

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

much better conditions for a time—until the population began to press again. Charles Booth, writing of modern economic conditions in London, shows the ruthless effect of that pressure on laborers from the country coming into the city. The first, he says, are reasonably well grown and healthy; the second generation smaller, weaker, more sickly; the third feeble, stunted, defective, degenerate; and *there is no fourth!*

Modern science and humanitarianism are changing all that. We are taking every means to preserve the most undesirable stock. Those who are able to earn are taxed to support those who are not. The best is handicapped by the worst, and this increasingly so as we learn new ways of keeping incompetents alive. It is true that in some places we are applying drastic methods of birth control by sterilizing the patently unfit, but even that is objected to by some tender hearts.

Perhaps since birth is woman's business it is right that she have some voice in discussing its control. Is it a pleasure or a duty for her to go through with the long and not wholly agreeable processes of childbearing, with all the ensuing care and labor of nursing and rearing children, merely in order to have them destroyed by warfare and disease, or kept alive at that degrading "saturation point" which falls just short of famine?

Women as a rule love their children. They suffer when they lose them. Quite apart from suffering there is grave economic waste in all that human energy poured into little graves, and taken from the care of the surviving family to be so hopelessly misspent. Mrs. Sanger's appeal for the over-burdened mother is a just one, it is enough to warrant prompt action, to justify birth control; but there is far more to be considered than any personal feeling, however strong.

The business of the female, as such, is not only the reproduction but the improvement of species. If that duty had been added to the ancient mandate as to replenishing the earth, it would have made the idea more acceptable to those who find it much easier to believe than to think. Still we are able to see it for ourselves now, and to see also that it is most essentially woman's work.

That it is her duty to bear children has been universally ad-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mitted, even urged; but that she should have the decision as to when, where and how many, is not so plain to most of us. For so long her high mission was summed up in the simple formula of "bearing him a son", and her condition as a prospective mother defined "as ladies wish to be who love their lords", that we are slow to grasp the distinct proposition that it is her place to regulate the population of the earth.

This means citizenship in the highest sense. If her race is decreasing, all patriotic duty should call for a higher birth rate; if it is crowding its limits and demanding someone else's country to spread in, then there is equally patriotic need for a lower birth rate. Biologically, politically, economically and ethically, women should face their special work of regulating and improving the race.

An active sense of social motherhood is desperately needed among the women of today, if we are to put a stop to war, to cease producing defectives, and to begin the conscious improvement of our stock.

With all this to be said for birth control, what is to be said against it? Simply this, that popular knowledge of preventive methods tends to encourage the selfishness of some married women and the incontinence of others, married or not. All this is true.

There are men and women to whom marriage is merely legalized indulgence, who deliberately prefer not to have children to interfere with their pleasures. Wishing a new name for an old relation they call it "companionate marriage". The social effect of this is gradually to weed out that kind of people, thus reducing the population without serious loss, either in numbers or quality.

Aside from these barren unions, we have that proportion of persons who seek sex indulgence without marriage, and whose activities have long been recognized as so deleterious as to be called "the social evil". The usual number of these is vastly increased by that new contingent who are infected by Freudian and sub-Freudian theories as to the hygienic necessity of such conduct. To these it is of immense assistance to have the means of avoiding resultant children, and they certainly take advantage of their opportunities.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But again, the social result is the elimination of this kind of people, if they continue their practices; while if they later decide that they want children, there is as yet no proof that such children will be any worse than those of previous years when it was openly believed that "a reformed rake makes the best husband".

Looking forward to an orderly and peaceful world, with competition in the arts and sciences, in invention and discovery, rather than in methods of military destruction, it is apparent that a regulated population is essential to health, peace and prosperity. The wholly safe and normal method of such regulation is to develop a race less sex crazy than at present, and capable of rational continence when it is necessary.

Pending such development, the less desirable methods now so largely in use seem better than to keep on in blind overproduction. But while restriction should be urged upon many races as sheer economic and political necessity, and upon many individuals for a variety of reasons, there is at the same time a need for a definite increase in some stocks unless they wish to vanish from the earth.

For the women of a race to become slackers in this primitive duty is contemptible. The charge lies close at our own doors, for the women of the stock that made our country, and whose birth rate used to be such that if they had kept it up we should be as numerous as we are now—and Americans, without any immigration whatever—these women have so ignored this duty that some of our highest types have a mere fraction of a child, as it were.

Our population needs regulating both ways.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE PROBLEM OF THE MISSISSIPPI

BY MAJOR-GENERAL W. M. BLACK, U. S. A., RET.

WHEN in 1717 the engineer, De la Tour, built a levee one mile long to protect the new city of New Orleans from overflow, the attempt to control the flow of the Mississippi was begun. Other settlers in Louisiana followed his example, and by 1828 almost continuous lines of levees bordered the Mississippi as far north as the Red River. In 1850 the United States granted to the several States which bordered the river title to the unsold swamp and overflowed lands within their limits, to provide a fund for reclaiming the districts subject to inundation. About the same time a general feeling of alarm arose among the dwellers along the lower river lest the confinement of the flood waters above should raise the flood heights in the lower river and again cause destructive overflows. An appeal was made to the Federal Government, and in 1850 Captain (later, General) A. A. Humphreys, of the Engineers, U. S. A., was ordered to investigate the questions of flood protection and channel improvement along the lower Mississippi. From 1857 to 1861 he was assisted in this work by Lieutenant (later, General) H. L. Abbot, of the Topographical Engineers. Their report, submitted in 1861, was received by the engineers of the world as a most valuable contribution to the science of hydraulics and remains a standard authority on the regimen of the Mississippi River. This report advocated the partial control of the floods by means of levees.

The first attempt by the Federal Government to regulate the low water flow for improving navigation was begun in 1837 by Lieutenant (later, General) Robert E. Lee, of the Engineers, U. S. A., at St. Louis, Missouri. During the Civil War work was suspended, and at its close the levees were in bad condition. Again the Federal Government investigated, and in 1869 General Humphreys and Major Abbot submitted further reports. In 1874 a board of military and civil engineers was directed to report

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on a permanent plan for the reclamation of the alluvial basin of the Mississippi subject to inundation. This board reported: That a resort to cut-offs would be dangerous and useless; that the diversion of tributaries would be impracticable; that reservoirs for impounding flood waters would be impracticable for lack of proper size; that artificial outlets would be dangerous and impracticable; and that levees constituted the only practicable plan.

By the Act of June 28, 1879, Congress provided for the creation of a Mississippi River Commission of seven members, to form such "plans and estimates as will correct, permanently locate and deepen the channel and protect the banks of the Mississippi River; improve and give safety and ease to the navigation thereof; prevent destructive floods; promote and facilitate commerce, trade and the postal service." The commission has been in existence and actively engaged in its duties since that date. The original commission consisted of Colonels Q. A. Gillmore, C. B. Comstock and C. R. Suter, Corps of Engineers, U. S. Army; Professor Henry Mitchell, U. S. Coast Survey; and Captain James B. Eads, Major B. M. Herrod and General Benjamin Harrison (later President) from civil life. Changes in the membership have been made from time to time and the list includes many well known engineers.

In addition to the studies and work enumerated above, committees of Congress from time to time have held extended hearings on the various phases of the problem in which representatives of various interested communities and of commercial bodies as well as private individuals have been encouraged to present their views at length, and the technical periodicals of the country have published numerous articles on the subject, so that all the phases of the problem have been presented and widely discussed.

It is a significant fact that all these studies have led to but one conclusion—that for protection against floods, reliance must be placed on a system of levees, assisted by a complete protection of the river banks against erosion, together with the use of the Atchafalaya River as an outlet for a limited portion of the flood waters.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

II

The section of the Mississippi River between the mouth of the Ohio River and the Gulf of Mexico is known as the lower river, and it is in this section that the problem of the Mississippi is found. Here the river flows through bottom lands averaging forty miles in width between the foothills which limit the thalweg (valley) of the river, and about six hundred miles long, from north to south.

Running water has the faculty of carrying with it in suspension a quantity of silt, the amount of which varies with the velocity of the current. When the velocity of flow lessens, some of this silt is deposited. After the bottom lands had reached a certain elevation, at low water the river traversed them in a definite bed. Then when the river was in flood, the silt laden waters spread beyond this bed. The overflow water had its velocity lessened and deposits were made, in greatest amount just beyond the low water banks. As a result, these bottom lands slope down laterally from the river, falling seven feet in the first mile and about six inches to the mile beyond that limit. Their slope downward to the Gulf of Mexico is at an average rate of about eight inches to the mile. The river at low water thus runs in a trough along a crest line of the bottom lands.

As might be expected, since the banks and bed of the river are made up of materials deposited by the river, these materials are easily subject to erosion and movement by the waters. This action through the years has caused the river channel to be a series of bends, or open loops. Each loop increases the length of the channel and decreases the slope and the consequent velocity of flow, until today the low water slope and velocity of flow reflect a delicate balance between the current velocity and the resisting power of the banks. In the loops the current is thrown by centrifugal force against the concave banks, raising the water level and causing erosion. The filaments of water along these banks move in a spiral course down and across the river bottom to the opposite bank, carrying with them some of the eroded material. The concave bank is thus kept steep while the convex bank is built out and has a more gentle slope.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

At the point between two bends where the concave shore of one loop reverses its curvature to become the convex shore of the next loop, the waters spread, and a portion of the materials carried in suspension, or pushed along the bottom, is deposited and a bar is formed. Such a point is termed a crossing. The course of the river is thus a series of pools and bars. At low water the average depth between Cairo and the mouth of the Red River is from 31½ to 48½ feet, with a minimum channel depth over the bars of 8 feet. The average slope of the surface is about 0.4 inches a mile. Between the mouth of the Red River and New Orleans, the average low water depth is 84 feet and the average surface slope is 0.02 inches a mile. Below New Orleans, the slope of the river is affected by the tides of the Gulf of Mexico, which have a range of 1.2 feet.

The low water discharge of the river at Columbus, Ky., twenty miles below Cairo, is 71,000 feet a second; at Vicksburg, Miss., 97,000 feet a second; and at New Orleans, 135,000 feet a second. In 1926 the Mississippi River Commission reported the following maximum recorded discharges: Columbus, Ky., 2,015,000 feet a second; Vicksburg, 1,826,000 feet a second; and at New Orleans, 1,358,000 feet a second. At the rate of discharge at Columbus, Ky., given for the highest flood of record in 1926, the volume of water passing in 4.8 hours is sufficient to cover to a depth of one foot an area equal to that of the State of Rhode Island.

The advance of a river flood is marked by an increase of current velocity and erosion, and in the volume of sediment, partly in suspension in the water and partly pushed along the bottom. The low water channels over the bars become obliterated and the flood waters form their own channels. After the crest of the flood has passed, the current velocity decreases and there is an increase in the deposit of sediment. As the water falls, the low water channels over the bars are gradually cut out and the river bed readjusts itself to the low water conditions. During floods the increase of depth over the bars is not measured by the amount of rise of the water surface. Up to a flood stage of twenty feet, at least, for each foot of rise of the surface there is an elevation of the bottom of six inches. This disappears before the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

low water channel conditions have been regained. The widespread belief that the bed of the Mississippi has been gradually elevated under the influence of the levees has been proved to be erroneous.

The amount of soil moved by the river is enormous. In 1909 it was officially reported that the waters of the Mississippi River had to take care of a volume of materials amounting to 1,250,000,000 cubic yards annually, a volume equivalent to a mass one mile square and almost 1,200 feet high. A portion of this is left in newly built-up banks of the river and a portion (300,000,000 cubic yards) is carried in suspension and pushed along the river bottom into the Gulf of Mexico.

III

The problem of the Mississippi as it is presented to the engineers is threefold. The first to be met successfully was the improvement of the mouth of the river so as to obtain and maintain a deep channel of entrance and exit for the port of New Orleans. This portion of the problem has been satisfactorily solved by the construction of the jetty channels through the South and Southwest Passes. Before improvement, the limiting channel depth in the Passes was nine feet, while today the limiting channel depths through the South and Southwest Passes are 33 feet and 38 feet, respectively, with safe channel widths.

The second of the problems has been to create and maintain a channel suitable for navigation by river boats and barges between St. Louis and New Orleans during the low water stage of the river. The third is that of flood control. These two are closely interrelated. If the flood waters are left free to act as they will, no one can predict from year to year where the next year's low water channel will be found, nor what will be the least depth in the bars. Under such conditions, a river port of one year may find itself inland the next, and river carriers may have to be tied up indefinitely at wharves by reason of insufficient depths over the bars. It was this condition in the past which made the river so uncertain a pathway as to prevent its carriers from competing with the railways, and killed the river commerce.

The solution of this phase of the general problem has been in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

confining the low water discharge of the river to a definite channel by works which could be overflowed during the flood season without destruction, and which, when uncovered, would again confine the river water to a definite path; in revetting caving banks; in assisting and hastening the formation of the low water channels after floods by dredging; and in confining the flood waters by levees. The works for limiting and defining the low water channel widths are so devised as to cause the river itself to build up new banks from the sediment it carries. As soon as these new banks are built to a height above the ordinary high water stage, they become covered by a growth of willows, and thereafter are practically permanent in position. The river regulation works are not yet complete, but, aided by a comparatively small amount of dredging annually, they maintain a limiting low water channel depth of nine feet through the lower river, and of eight feet in the middle river between St. Louis and Cairo, with but very short periods of interruption. The commerce of the river has been revived and the United States barge line between St. Louis and Cairo has more freight offered for transportation both north and south than it can accommodate, carried profitably at rates twenty per cent. less than the corresponding rates by rail.

IV

The floods of the Mississippi are caused by excessive rainfall. Winds from the southeast cause rainfall in the Mississippi Valley and the valleys of its tributaries flowing from the west. Winds from the southwest cause rains in the valleys of the tributaries from the east. These moisture laden winds drop the greater part of their burden near the coast, the amount of rainfall diminishing as the distance from the coast increases. The average annual rainfall at New Orleans is 57.5 inches; at Memphis, 50.3 inches; at St. Louis, 37.2 inches; at St. Paul, 29.6 inches; at Cincinnati, 38.2 inches; at Pittsburgh, 36.5 inches; and at Bismarck, N. D., 17.5 inches. At the headwaters of the Mississippi, the mean annual rainfall is reported to be 25 inches, and at the headwaters of the Missouri, 13 inches.

The volume of water reaching a stream after a rain is termed

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the run-off, and the rate of run-off from a given territory for a given depth of rainfall will vary markedly. If the soil is porous and dry the rate is lowered. If the surface is impervious, due to a coating of ice or to being watersoaked by earlier rains, the rate is increased. To the surface run-off is added later the water reaching the streams through sub-surface flow.

The floods of the Mississippi are caused by floods in its tributaries. Col. Townsend, President of the Mississippi River Commission from 1912 to 1920, gives the estimated maximum discharges in feet a second of the principal tributaries as follows: upper Mississippi River, 450,000; the Missouri, 900,000; the Ohio, 1,400,000; the Arkansas, 450,000; and the Red, 220,000. There is also a large flood discharge from the Yazoo, St. Francis, White, Tensas and Ouachita rivers. When the flood waters of any tributary reach the main stream at a normal low stage, the river channel can take care of them without overflow. However, when two or more tributary floods are superposed, the channel capacity is not great enough and the excess waters spread beyond the banks.

The ordinary volume of flow in the Mississippi varies greatly through the year. The low season usually is from August to December. From January to March the river is at a medium stage. Flood conditions usually are found between March and July.

The various means which have been proposed for the better control of floods comprise reforestation; straightening the river by cut-offs; levees, with bank protection; reservoirs; spillways; and outlets. All of these measures have had ardent advocates and all have been thoroughly discussed and considered.

V

A full discussion of the influence of forests on climates and on floods, by Willis L. Moore, then Chief of the United States Weather Bureau, was published in 1909. In this discussion Dr. Moore reviewed the mass of available data, including the records of the Weather Bureau. His conclusions may be summarized as follows: Forestation has little or no effect on rainfall; during the period in which accurate observations have been made, the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

amount of rainfall has not increased or decreased to any appreciable extent; floods are caused by excessive rainfall and the source of the rain over the central and eastern points of the United States is the vapor borne by the warm southerly winds from the Gulf of Mexico and the adjacent ocean into the interior of the country, but little crossing the Rocky Mountains from the Pacific; the watershed of the headwaters of streams is comparatively small and the run-off is insufficient to cause floods other than locally in the mountain streams; the run-off of the rivers is not materially affected by any factor other than rainfall; high waters are not higher nor low waters lower than formerly—in fact, there appears to be a tendency in late years toward a slightly better low water flow in summer; floods are not of greater frequency and longer duration than formerly.

Other careful investigators in our own country, as well as abroad, notably Colonels Burr, Chittenden and Townsend in the United States, have reached the same conclusions.

The overwhelming weight of authority is to the effect that reforestation, when possible, is highly desirable for many reasons, but that it would have but little effect, if any, on flood control.

It has been suggested that if cut-offs were made between bends, when these bends markedly increase the length of the river and thus decrease the slope, the velocity of the flood currents would be so increased that flood heights would be lessened. Experience has shown, however, that though such an effect is produced in the reach of the river immediately above the cut-off, it is but temporary, and the relief above is more than offset by increased injury below. In a cut-off which occurred from natural causes in 1884, the length of the river was reduced by 12½ miles. The river at once began the work of restoring its former slope and by 1895 had regained a length of five miles, with a great destruction of valuable agricultural land. As a result of this and of other similar experiences, the engineers responsible for the improvement of the river and for the control of its floods make every effort to revet the caving banks when new cut-offs threaten to occur. Were unlimited funds available for river regulation, it might be practicable and somewhat advantageous

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to shorten the river channel at one or two points where today the slope is much below the average, but the general effect on flood heights would be too small to justify the expenditures and risks attendant on such an attempt. Engineers experienced in the river work condemn a resort to cut-offs.

The volume of soil falling into the Mississippi annually has already been stated. The breaking down of the banks occurs during all stages of the river. At low stages where the current impinges upon it, the bank is eroded and undermined, resulting in the fall of the upper bank and the formation of a new bank slope. If, during low water, the upper portion of the bank has dried out and the slope of the bank is steep, during the succeeding flood period the upper bank becomes water soaked and when the water level lowers and the bank is no longer supported in part by the pressure of the water, the water soaked front of the bank breaks off and slumps into the low water channel. Another cause of bank failure is when a large mass of earth material rests upon a layer of quicksand or of very soft material. After a flood has passed, the soft layer may be squeezed out into the river channel by the superincumbent weight, or the soft material may be carried into the river by the drainage through it of water which has seeped through the surface soil further inland. In each case the result is a sinking of the river bank. On the lower river, sinking banks have been found where the drop has been fully 20 feet for nearly a mile up and down stream and with a width of several hundred feet. In other cases a large mass of material may rest upon a smooth inclined surface of rock or other slippery material. If this surface becomes coated with water, due to seepage from the surface after a heavy rain, the superincumbent mass may slide down the slope until it is arrested by some obstacle or falls into the river channel.

Any bank failure causes a new irregularity in the shore line and produces increased erosion; causing increased bar formation, and, in the loops, a danger of the formation of cut-offs. In addition to the loss of arable land, failing banks cause the precipitation into the river of trees, which become snags, dangerous to navigation; the destruction of levees and other structures built too close to the shore; as well as adding to the work which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PUBLIC LIBRARY
NEWARK, OHIO

the river must do to keep its channel clear for the passage of its waters.

Bank protection has always been considered as one of the requisites in the treatment of the river. In addition to its necessity for other reasons, the protection of the banks of the Mississippi and of its tributaries would increase the capacity of the river channel to carry off the excess flood waters, and would diminish flood crest heights by keeping out of the channel a great portion of the billion and a quarter cubic yards of soil moved by the river each year.

VI

Levees have been used for centuries in Asia and Europe for the confinement of flood waters. The first levee along the Mississippi, in 1717, had a height of about four feet. Today the height of the levees protecting New Orleans is over twenty feet, but less than 25.2 feet, the height recommended in 1914 by the Mississippi River Commission as necessary to confine a flood equal to that of 1912.

The increase in the height of the floods is easy to understand. Before the settlement of the Mississippi Valley the flood waters in excess of the bank-full channel capacity were able to spread over an area approximately 600 miles long by thirty to fifty miles wide, consisting in great part of fertile, arable land. The overflow waters drained from these lands gradually. The duration of high water stages was prolonged, with a lower height of the flood crest. In measure as the lands were brought under cultivation, additional levees were built. For many years levees were built first by individuals and later under State authorities, the cost being met by the sale of the reclaimed swamp lands and by local taxation.

After 1882 the General Government participated in Mississippi levee construction, and after 1887 the allotment and control of United States funds made available for levee construction was in the hands of the Mississippi River Commission under the proviso that for a levee in any locality the local interests must contribute one-third of the cost. In 1914, the Commission adopted a scale for levee heights between Cairo and the Gulf

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in which, for each locality, the height of the jetty was determined by adding three feet to the estimated height at that point which would be reached by confined flood waters of the greatest flood then on record. The increase in flood height, in part due to the extension of the levee system, is indicated by the record of the maximum gauge readings at Vicksburg, Mississippi, for the various high flood years, viz.: 1858, 46.9; 1897, 52; 1912, 51.6; 1922, 54.8; 1927, 58.7.

The levee system of the Mississippi extends from Rock Island to below New Orleans, and along the lower waters of a number of the tributaries, and in length aggregated in 1925, 1,833.8 miles. The system was then reported as 86.8 per cent completed.

Between 1882 and 1926 the following amounts have been expended in levee work:

By the United States from Government funds	$67,760,000
By the United States from contributed funds	13,189,000
By State and local organizations	147,972,000
Total	$228,921,000

The existing levee system cannot be looked upon as the result of a prearranged and well coördinated project, since a large portion of the levees were designed, located and built under different and independent authorities. Each year has witnessed some losses due to abandonment, or to destruction by the river. In 1926 the loss totalled about 3,300,000 cubic yards. Failure of the levees may arise from various causes. The levee cross-section may be too weak to withstand the pressure. The levee may slump when water-soaked, due to weakness or the erosion of the underlying bank, or due to the poor quality of the material of which it was built. A leak may be produced by a stratum of permeable materials, or by a hole made by a muskrat or other burrowing animal. The levees may be over-topped by the flood waters or by waves from passing steamboats. Whatever the initial cause may be, prompt action is required, for a flow across or through a levee once started increases rapidly and soon causes a crevasse.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VII

The flood of 1927 was caused by the unusually heavy rainfall in the valley of the river in March and April. The crest of a flood out of the Ohio and middle Mississippi had practically reached Cairo when excessive rains occurred during the week ending April 17, during which more than fourteen inches of rain fell in New Orleans in thirty-six hours, and the fall in Memphis and Little Rock was six to eight inches. So that the crest of floods of the White and Arkansas rivers arrived at Arkansas City on the Mississippi River at almost the same time as the crest of the flood from Cairo. At Cairo this flood was already 1.5 feet higher than any previously recorded and the junction of the floods caused an unprecedented rise along the lower river.

From records of previous floods it had been estimated that flood control plans must be such as would take care of a discharge of about 2,000,000 cubic feet a second. The Chief of Engineers now estimates that future projects must be such as will provide for a flow of 2,500,000 feet a second.

In 1927 the flood caused twelve crevasses in the levees of the main river below Cairo, which had an aggregate length of about five miles; three in the Arkansas; and several in the Red River and Atchafalaya systems, and caused the flooding of 18,000 of the 30,000 square miles of land protected by them. From the official report on the causes of the crevasses, it is found that two, and possibly three, were caused by caving banks; five were in levees below grade which were overflowed; one was cut by direct erosion; in three cases, leaks developed, causing slumps; at one the levee was accidentally rammed by a heavy vessel and broke; the remainder occurred in levees not designed to withstand so great a flood.

VIII

The fact is beyond dispute that by the use of reservoirs the run-off from the watershed above them can be regulated. In Minnesota the reservoirs at the headwaters of the Mississippi which have a combined area of 516 square miles, receive the run-off from a watershed of 3,800 square miles and have a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

capacity of 93,000,000,000 cubic feet. The effect of these reservoirs is not felt below Lake Pepin, fifty-two miles below St. Paul. A system of reservoirs has been proposed for the headwaters of the Allegheny and Monongahela rivers. Such a system would undoubtedly protect Pittsburgh against floods, but would not affect appreciably the flood heights of the Mississippi. The same conclusion holds for reservoirs at the headwaters of the Missouri and of its tributaries.

The Chief of Engineers has stated that "in the flood of 1913, if all the water flowing past Pittsburgh on the Ohio, all that flowing past St. Paul on the Mississippi, and all that flowing past Sioux City on the Missouri, had been held back by reservoirs, the flood waters south of Cairo would have been reduced by only two per cent."

The flood waters of the Mississippi which must be controlled come from rainfall on the territory along the main body of the river and those of its tributaries. During the flood of 1897 the river was above the bank-full stage at Cairo from March 1 to April 27. During this period the volume of flow in excess of what the channel could accommodate amounted to 2,236,550,000,000 cubic feet. Colonel Stickney, Member of the Mississippi River Commission, reported that to store this volume of water would require a reservoir capacity equal to an area of 8,022.5 square miles and 10 feet deep. In 1913, Colonel Townsend, President of the Mississippi River Commission, stated: "To have retained the Mississippi flood of 1912 within its banks would have required a reservoir in the vicinity of Cairo, Illinois, having an area of 7,000 square miles, slightly less than that of the State of New Jersey, and a depth of 15 feet, assuming that it would be empty when the river attained a bank-full stage."

It is thus evident that if excessive floods in the lower Mississippi are to be prevented by the storage of excess flood waters, this storage must be effected either by a reservoir of enormous capacity below Cairo, or by similar reservoirs on the lower Missouri and Ohio rivers. Such reservoirs must be so constructed as to receive the excess flood waters and hold them until the river has fallen to such a stage as to make its channel able to carry their discharge without overflow. The reservoirs must

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be empty when the flood approaches. This last condition is one which makes it difficult for a reservoir to fulfill the double function of flood control and of being a source of water power. The existing reservoirs at the headwaters of the Mississippi River were built for the purpose of providing an additional depth of water in the river above St. Paul, Minnesota, during the low water season, for purposes of navigation. All flowage rights around them had been secured by the United States. But during the period when the writer was in authority over them, each year there was a conflict of interests over the period of storage and the time and rate of their discharge. A power company operating on the river demanded a constant discharge. Farmers located around the reservoirs demanded an early emptying of the reservoirs in order that they might obtain a hay crop from the lands overflowed when the reservoirs were full. Navigation interests demanded the storage of the waters until the period of summer low water.

Reservoirs for flood control, to be effective, must be used for flood control irrespective of losses in power production or in agriculture. Under the conditions, a project to control the Mississippi floods by means of artificial reservoirs along the main river or its tributaries would prove both difficult and costly.

It was the very fact that the fertile bottoms along the Mississippi were much desired for agricultural use that caused the destruction of the natural storage reservoirs which formerly existed along the lower river, viz., the St. Francis basin, having an area of 6,706 square miles; the Yazoo Basin, with an area of 6,648 square miles; the White River basin, 956 square miles; and the Tensas, with 5,370 square miles.

Since 1897, levee construction has gone on continuously under the pressing demands of the people of the Mississippi Valley. In so far as known to the writer, no demand has yet been made for the restoration of the natural storage reservoirs along the lower river to their original condition of periodical overflows. The desire has been to hold fast to the rich protected basins and find some other means of controlling the Mississippi floods.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IX

A spillway for flood control is a long waste-weir built along the bank of a river for the purpose of carrying off a portion of the river flow after the river surface has risen to a certain height. It is usually supplied with movable gates or a movable dam along its crest for the regulation of the volume taken from the river. It feeds into a channel or pool from which the water is led away by an artificial channel, or it may feed into a storage reservoir. In any case the dam or levee on which the spillway is built, as well as the receiving channel, must be carefully protected against erosion by the flow of the diverted water. Spillways have been built along the upper Sacramento River to control the volume of flood flow. An outlet is simply a deep spillway.

It is evident that excepting when used in connection with a storage reservoir, spillways and outlets can be resorted to for the control of the Mississippi floods only where it is possible to form for the diverted waters an outlet into the Gulf of Mexico distinct from the mouths of the Mississippi. It is also evident that such an outlet cannot be made north of the northern boundary of Louisiana without a very great outlay.

The Pearl River flows through the middle of the State of Mississippi, east of and generally parallel to the Mississippi River. The shortest distance between the two rivers is a little over fifty miles. It would be physically possible to build a channel between them as an outlet, but it is doubtful if such a project would prove advisable from an economic standpoint. Similarly a connection might be made between the Arkansas and Red Rivers, with the Atchafalaya as an outlet. The Atchafalaya now forms an outlet. At one time the Red River entered into the Mississippi River at the western end of a deep bend or loop of the latter river. The Bayou Atchafalaya had its head close by the Red River mouth. Later the Mississippi made a cut-off across the east end of the loop, leaving the mouth of the Red and the head of the Atchafalaya joined to the Mississippi by a short reach of channel known as Old River. The ordinary discharge of the Red found its way to the Gulf through the Atchafalaya. Flood waters of the Red at times passed through

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Old River to the Mississippi, and flood waters of the Mississippi, conversely, at times passed through Old River to the Atchafalaya. The channel of Old River silted badly, and some years ago the question of closing it completely was seriously considered. The distance to the Gulf from the mouth of Old River is less than by way of the Mississippi, and it was feared that in some heavy flood period the Mississippi would abandon its own channel and cut a course to the Gulf through the Atchafalaya. It was then determined to maintain and deepen Old River, but to limit the volume of flow entering the Atchafalaya. Other outlets formerly existed along the west shore of the Mississippi, south of the Red, through bayous. These have all been closed. Outlets on the east side to Lakes Pontchartrain and Borgne have also been considered and rejected. The crevasse in the east bank levee below New Orleans made during 1927 by the State of Louisiana now makes an outlet into Lake Borgne and the Gulf. The entire subject has been under study by the Engineer Department of the Army for some months, and a report will be submitted to Congress at its next session. Regarding the problem, General Jadwin, Chief of Engineers, has recently said:

> The need for a revision of the Government project rests primarily on the following propositions: First this flood has shown that protection must be furnished throughout against greater floods than those which existing works were expected to meet even if all works contemplated by the present authorization had been completed; second, levees necessary for the protection of this great endangered region and not heretofore under the government jurisdiction should be brought thereunder; third, the problem is now manifestly national; fourth, the percentage of participation of the heavily taxed districts must be reduced; fifth, the law should be so modified that the Government shall have sufficient definite authority promptly to locate the works where the soundest engineering indicates they should be built, whether this involves larger levees, some strengthened and spaced farther apart, or spillways or reservoirs, or a combination of all these structures.
>
> The waters concerned come from a great variety of States and inflict their damage primarily on a limited number—some seven: at the same time we have an abiding confidence in the disposition of the country at large to treat all of its citizens fairly and to recognize that so great a threat hanging over the heads of seven sovereign States is in reality a threat and a challenge to the entire Nation. It is less serious only than war itself, and must be met squarely and without delay by the Nation as a whole.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TOO MUCH DEMOCRACY

BY C. H. BRETHERTON

In a prosperous and enlightened community the forms and processes of government matter very little. When, on the other hand, the community is poor, when the economic struggle is desperate, when men can become rich only at the expense of their neighbors and the "snatchers" and the "snatched from" seek, the ones to acquire and the others to hold, with every weapon they can lay hands on, then the practise of government becomes vastly important and the theory of government a subject of general concern.

An exhaustive review of the subject inevitably leads us to the conclusion that national poverty and Democracy, like crabbed age and youth, cannot live together. When taxes are high and incomes small, then there is talk of a dictator—naturally, since dictators are the cheapest form of government a nation can have. When there is plenty of money and plenty of work, when enterprise is in the air and the standard of living tends to rise, then Democracy—a system of government which enables anybody who cannot or will not work to earn an honest livelihood as a politician—tends to assert itself.

But nations have their ups and downs, and the proverbial "three generations from clogs to clogs" is not confined to the weaving shed. "Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey," says the poet, "when wealth accumulates and men decay;" and the first symptom of decay in man, who was intended by Nature to be an individualist, red in tooth and claw, is that he embraces democratic principles.

But what is Democracy? asks the reader; determined that before he permits himself to be seduced into a fundamental controversy we shall each know what the other is talking about. I reply that, as the farmer said when he saw the hippopotamus, "there ain't no such an animal." Democracy is a relative term,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

like whiskey. You remember that the Scotchman said that some whiskey was better than others, but there was no bad whiskey. Some forms of government are more democratic than others. An oligarchy is more democratic than an autocracy. A constitutional system involving adult suffrage is more democratic, *ceteris paribus*, than one with a property qualification, and one which includes the Referendum and Initiative is more democratic than one which has neither.

There is not and never has been a pure democracy, and there never will be. Even if it were possible to devise a workable system under which all the people made all the laws all the time, it would still be necessary to entrust the functions of the executive to individuals who, however hedged about by laws and restrictions, would still have to do a lot of things that a great many people objected to. So when we use the word "Democracy", as in the title of this article, we simply mean a constitutional system in which a relatively large number of people have a finger in the governmental pie. How difficult it is to carry the matter further is seen when we consider the definitions of Democracy that have been propounded by men who should have known better. Lincoln called it "government *of* the people, *by* the people, *for* the people". All governments are *of* the people and profess to be *for* the people. The earmark of Democracy is government (theoretically) *by* the people. The more cautious English jurisprudent, Austin, defined a democratic system of government as one in which "the will of the people *ultimately* prevails". What difference is there between a constitutional system in which the will of the people ultimately prevails—of course by constitutional methods—and one in which it not merely prevails at a pinch but is consulted every time there is a law to be passed or an executive act to be performed? A vast difference, obviously. The former is not Democracy at all. It may be a permissive despotism, such as Signor Mussolini exercises. It may be bureaucracy whose activities are just a shade less expensive and troublesome than would be the effort involved in replacing it by something else.

It is not by considering what Democracy means, but what government means and what "the people" means, that we shall well and truly lay the foundation of our argument. Government

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is easily defined. It is the direction, by law or by executive action, of the actions of the individual for the benefit of the community. To the extent that the citizen is so directed, his liberty is curtailed. To the extent that he is left to do as he pleases, he enjoys the priceless boon of liberty. But in between doing as one pleases and doing what someone else commands lies a third position. What of the citizen who has instructed somebody else to order him to do things he does not wish to do, for his own benefit? Is his liberty curtailed? Obviously it is, unless he can promptly revoke the authority to give the order and refuse to obey it *uno ictu*. Democracy has nowhere yet reached that pitch of completeness, but there is no reason, apart from considerations of time and space, why it should not. Already we have the spectacle of the American people enacting Prohibition by a thoroughly democratic recourse to the ballot box, and immediately thereafter violating and defying, not in ones and twos but *en masse*, the law they have just made.

The metaphysical question here involved does not really call for an answer, because it can never be definitely established that a particular democrat has or has not delegated to another the power to control his liberty of action until such time as he shall think fit to revoke that power. Democracy does not envisage each man as being a law to himself, directly or by delegating his authority to another, but as being a law to everybody else. In a word it embraces fundamentally that sublime institution, the Tyranny of the Fifty-One Per Cent.

In support of this conception, not one single cogent argument can be advanced. Unable to explain it on reasonable grounds, Montesquieu propounded the Social Contract theory, which supposes the individual, at some remote stage of civilization, to have agreed to surrender his own complete liberty of action in return for the protection and coöperation of the crowd. No such thing happened or could have happened. Communal civilization developed under the ægis of the Big Stick. Supreme at first by virtue of his individual prowess, the Tyrant soon came to rule with the assistance of others. His was in fact a tyranny of fifty-one per cent. of the common denominator of numbers, arms, organization, character and determination. His Prætorians or

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

feudal barons or two-sword men would say to themselves, "We are really supreme; but as long as the Tyrant does our bidding, we will not dethrone him." Then, as the people became better organized and more united, they in turn said, "We are really supreme. We can kick out the Tyrant and his Prætorians and feudal barons and two-sword men whenever we have a mind to, but as long as they make successful wars and administer justice and do not tax us too heavily, we will let them bide." And here and there, just to show who was top dog, they revolted and made the Tyrant toe the line, whereof Magna Charta is the most famous example. Later they carried the thing a step further. With civilization becoming daily more complicated, they discovered that they could do with much more government *for* the people and less government *of* the people (for the benefit of the Tyrant and his friends) than a monarch with no constitutional strings round his leg was likely to give them. So the ballot box came into the picture, but there has been no uniformity in its use. America chooses a fresh Tyrant every four years, supplies him with hand-picked legislators, but otherwise leaves him pretty much of a tyrant. Britain keeps an hereditary Tyrant but has transferred all his power to his advisers, whom it replaces whenever it thinks they are getting too fresh or going to sleep on their jobs.

In thus replacing the one tyrant by the many, society has done itself no good. For a despot is occasionally a wise and benevolent despot and as such endows the State with laws and institutions and sows the seeds of learning and fosters creative genius to an extent that a whole series of stupid and vicious tyrants can only partly annul. But the Tyrant Demos has no inspiration. When it is emotional it does infinite harm (in which case it refers to itself as "the mob"), and when it is feeling high-minded it is, for reasons I shall make plain, even more of a nuisance. The fifty-one per cent. is at its best when it is apathetic—like a boa constrictor—which fortunately it often is. Its one redeeming feature is a sort of shrewd instinct, which enables it to detect and gainsay the ineptitudes of those it entrusts with power when they do not coincide with its own.

There are two outstanding objections to Democracy or Government by Counting Noses. In the first place the fifty-one per

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cent. and the forty-nine per cent. are never the same, so that no *modus vivendi* or compromise can be arrived at between majority and minority. A permanent majority always has some consideration for the minority. A political majority is ruthless because its business is to deliver a knock-out blow to a political minority and disappear. Majority and minority are never quite the same, but the result is the same. For the few are wiser than the many, and the process results in a composite victory of folly over wisdom.

Secondly, though the fifty-one per cent. theoretically rule the roost, they, being politically apathetic, are easily made use of by the politically energetic, who are either professional politicians or cranks, the latter being, of course, infinitely the more harmful of the two, because they are usually to be found committing fundamental assaults on nature and truth from what appear to be the highest moral motives.

At this point we must pause to note one important thing. Democracy is least harmful when the democrats are most ignorant. It only becomes really impossible when the people are reasonably sophisticated, politically alert, and sufficiently educated to have opinions on everything but not enough to have sound opinions on very much. An ignorant and debased proletariat will commit occasional excesses, but normally it refrains from political activity out of sheer incompetence, leaving the business of governing and law making to those whom it has appointed for that purpose. The politician class, whether it be professional, as in America, or amateur, as in Britain, is generally pretty astute, with the result that while powerful "interests" do not suffer, government on the whole is conducted on safe, sane and conservative lines.

Of course, if the leaders happen to be stupid or fanatical, even more harm is done than if the people took matters into their own hands. An illuminating example of this is furnished by the prolonged coal strike in Britain in 1926. The miners would have gone back to work within a few days on the terms finally accepted, but their leaders, one of whom happened to be a Bolshevik and the other an obstinate fathead, counselled otherwise and the miners said, "We pays b——s to do job. Let b——s get on with

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it!" and patiently stayed away from the pits until told to go back.

When the general standard of intelligence is high, Democracy becomes impossible. Let us rather put it in another way and say that between a community having a comparatively low order of intelligence, no education and no political sophistication, and a nation of intellectuals,—which has never existed but if it did could accommodate itself to any form of government or none at all,—there lies a point at which Democracy is impossible because the people are too enterprising and active minded to let others do their political thinking for them, and still too ignorant and narrow to do their own political thinking with success.

Of all the democratic peoples the United States alone has reached this point, and it is the United States that alone presents the spectacle of Democracy as a gigantic failure. A crisis in national affairs generally stimulates a flight from Democracy. We have seen it in Italy, in Turkey, in Spain, in Poland and elsewhere. It is in the United States that we shall see, if anywhere, the flight from Democracy deliberately undertaken by a nation seeking, in a moment of vision though not of emergency, to replace an unworkable and unworthy system of government by a better one.

There is no country in the world where the fifty-one per cent. interferes with the liberty of the forty-nine per cent. so often or so fundamentally as in the United States. More inhibitory laws are annually placed on its statute books, State and Federal, than on all the statute books of Europe together. Theoretically, these inhibitory laws represent the desires of the majorityof the people —who are presumed to inherit from their Puritan forbears a mania for making each other be good by numbers. Actually they are the work of a few cranks and fanatics, enthusiastic, well organized and well supplied with money—since Big Business is always on the side of the inhibitionists—and as active as the mass of the electorate is apathetic. As new and unwanted laws have multiplied, respect for the law as such has weakened and a high premium has been placed upon the arts of the lawyers skilled in defeating the law. While leading the world in the number and variety of its legal inhibitions, the United States also leads it in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the number and variety of its criminals and the ease with which they elude detection and arrest.

These difficulties are enhanced by the Federal system. Half a hundred legislatures, half a hundred executives, half a hundred judiciaries—what an intolerable waste of money and effort and time! And for what? An American is an American wherever you meet him. To the European he is an astonishingly constant type. No questions of orthodoxy separate Maine from California, no geographical considerations, expressed in terms of economic interests and through them embodied in laws of a widely divergent character, distinguish Arkansas from Tennessee or Texas from Vermont. If New York and Oregon, or Alabama and Michigan, were to exchange legislatures, laws, judiciaries and executives tomorrow, ninety-nine per cent. of the citizens of each State would never know the difference. But while the United States is becoming more of a political and economic and social unit with every year that passes, the multiple-state system effectively prevents any sane unity of moral and intellectual ideals by enabling the cranks and fanatics to achieve their inhibitory aims piecemeal and by giving the inhibited citizen fifty codes of law that he can flout and despise instead of one that he must respect.

These things do not at present seem to trouble Americans very much. They are too busy becoming more prosperous, more industrious and, along certain limited lines, more civilized. But if they ever get all the money they can use, or if they become poor and have to economise, they will surely sit back and ask themselves whether their present political system, with its freak laws, its graft and corruption, its ten thousand murders a year, its lynchings, its universal bootlegging, and its universal contempt for the law,—all directly attributable not to human but to Constitutional weaknesses,—is worthy of the greatest, the richest and in many respects the most civilized people in the world.

What they will do, having asked this question and answered it in the negative, remains to be seen. Certainly they will abolish the Federal system, which is not of the slightest use, replacing all the local legislatures with an all-powerful Congress. All laws but those of the United States, suitably enlarged, will be repealed, and all State judiciaries and executives will be incorporated into

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

what are now the Federal Executive and Judiciary. They will take the judiciary completely out of politics and abolish the jury system, which has proved a hopeless failure everywhere but in England and has been tolerably satisfactory there only because of the complete moral control which the judge has over the jury.

They will make the Presidency a life appointment (power to remove him on impeachment for misconduct being reserved to a two-thirds majority of both Houses of Congress), because the present four years term is wasteful and highly detrimental to the even tenor of the nation's economic way. The President will also be given power to dissolve Congress or at any rate the House of Representatives in the event of a bill which in his opinion the electorate would not endorse being passed over his veto. All permanent public officials will be placed under what I believe is known in the United States as the Civil Service Commission. If they have become really wise the American people will abolish the Senate as at present constituted and replace it with a small Upper Chamber of legislative experts appointed for life from a post-graduate College of Statecraft, as members of which they will have devoted a number of years to study or to the practical work of diplomacy, arbitration and so forth.

It is possible that by the time the United States people are ready to make even such superficial changes as these, the world's political and economic ideas will have undergone a further change. New political forms of which we have no conception may have been devised. The only thing certain is that the American people cannot go on as they are, or they will soon be burning each other at the stake for not believing in the personal Devil.

It may also be urged that America will never abolish nose-counting from its politics. That may well be; and desirable as more drastic changes might be, those above outlined as not merely possible but probable do not, it will be observed, assail the fundamental principle. They merely change the political machinery so as to make it difficult if not impossible for the fifty-one per cent. to be continually poking their noses into the forty-nine per cent.'s affairs. To do that, in this age of collectivism and paternalism and Socialism and Communism and every other sort of "ism", is to do a lot.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VOICES ACROSS THE SEA

BY BANCROFT GHERARDI

I

On the morning of January 7, 1927, commercial telephone service was opened between New York and London by a conversation between Walter S. Gifford, President of the American Telephone and Telegraph Company, and Sir G. Evelyn P. Murray, Secretary of the British Post Office Department. At 8:45 A.M., New York time, Mr. Gifford removed his telephone receiver from the hook and asked for Sir Evelyn at the British Post Office in London. One minute later, at 1:46 P.M., London time, Sir Evelyn answered this telephone call, and after mutual greetings, they dedicated the service to the use of the public. This simple ceremony was a milestone in the progress of communication through the spoken word. It marked the establishment of telephonic communication between the Old World and the New.

At rapid intervals thereafter, the service was extended westward throughout the United States and throughout England, Scotland and Wales, and today any one of the 17,000,000 telephones of the Bell Telephone System in the United States, as well as the telephones in Cuba, may connect with any one of the 1,400,000 telephones of the British Post Office System. Service between Great Britain and the principal cities of Eastern Canada was opened through the London and New York connection on October 3.

The difference in local time between the two ends of any telephone conversation over the transatlantic connection is a constant reminder to every user of this service of the substantial part of the earth which is spanned by it. The New York business man who, immediately on arriving at his office in the morning, calls his London correspondent, finds the latter has just returned from his lunch. Even more marked is this in the case of com-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

munications between the Pacific Coast and Great Britain. San Francisco and London are so nearly on the opposite sides of the earth that there are no overlapping hours in the business day, and in the winter it is possible for anyone on the Pacific Coast to talk by the light of the rising sun to a person in London who is at the same instant seeing the last rays of the setting sun.

II

The connection between the United States and Great Britain is made by means of a radio telephone link, connecting at each end with the regular commercial telephone systems of the two countries.

Let us suppose you, at a telephone at your home in Chicago, are talking to me at a hotel in London. The conversation goes to the long distance switchboard in New York City in the usual way over the regular wire telephone system. From the long distance switchboard position, through which all trans-atlantic service is handled at the American end, a telephone circuit extends to the radio sending station at Rocky Point, Long Island, a distance of about one hundred miles. Here the feeble telephone current, started by your voice, is magnified many millions of times and its characteristics are impressed on the high frequency carrier current of several hundred horse power. This current is radiated into space from the antennæ on the towers. A very minute part of this current, less than one-billionth part, is picked up by the receiving station in the North of Scotland; is magnified, transformed back into an ordinary telephone current, and sent on a pair of wires to the main toll switchboard in London; from which point it goes to the telephone in my hotel, by means of the regular telephone wires.

But, when I reply to you, my reply does not go over the same route beyond the main toll switchboard at London. There, it goes over a special telephone circuit to the radio transmitting station at Rugby; is magnified, combined with the carrier current and radiated, to be picked up by the American receiving station at Houlton, Maine; at which point it is transformed back into a regular telephone current and sent on a special telephone circuit

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to the long distance toll board at New York. Here, it joins with the ordinary telephone circuit which brought your voice from Chicago to New York, and this takes my reply back to you in Chicago.

So, while you are talking to me from Chicago to New York, thence by wire to Rocky Point, thence by radio to Cupar (Scotland), and from Cupar by wire to London, I am talking to you from London by wire to Rugby, thence by radio to Houlton (Maine), and thence to New York by wire. This separation of the sending and receiving stations at each end is desirable in any case, and is made necessary by the fact that the radio telephone service in the two directions is worked on a single carrier wave length.

III

From the early days of the telephone the theoretical possibilities of radio telephony were recognized, but its practical realization grew out of the work of the Bell Telephone engineers that made transcontinental telephony possible. In 1909, I went to the Pacific Coast on a business trip with General John J. Carty, who was then Chief Engineer of the American Telephone and Telegraph Company, while I was one of his assistants. After being on the Coast for about two months, on the return trip we had a conversation which I can remember as clearly as if it had taken place yesterday. General Carty told me how much he had felt isolated from his office in New York and how difficult he had found it to deal with the many questions which had come up and be sure that we had a common understanding with those in New York.

He then said, "Gherardi, we ought to find out how to extend our telephone lines and give commercial service to the Pacific Coast."

I replied, "Yes, sir."

Carty: "Do we know how to do it?"

Gherardi: "No, sir."

Carty: "Can we find out?"

Gherardi: "Yes, sir."

Carty: "How long will it take?"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Gherardi: "No one can say definitely now, perhaps five years, perhaps more."

Carty: "As soon as I get back I shall ask Mr. Vail for the necessary authority to proceed with the work."

Immediately upon General Carty's return he secured this authority from Mr. Vail, then President of the American Telephone and Telegraph Company. The work was undertaken, and in less than six years commercial service was opened from coast to coast.

Before the completion of this work, our scientists and engineers engaged on it saw that in the apparatus and methods developed for transcontinental telephony were the germs from which could be produced a practicable and useful radio telephone system.

Research and laboratory tests were intensively pressed, and by the spring of 1915 speech was successfully transmitted by radio, first for a distance of about two hundred miles, and then for one thousand miles. The results of these experiments warranted the prediction that, working along similar lines, with still more powerful apparatus and larger transmitting towers, it would be possible to transmit speech across the Atlantic, a distance of more than three thousand miles. For the purpose of this experiment, the use of the towers of the radio telegraph station at Arlington, Virginia, was obtained from the United States Navy and they were equipped by us with special radio telephone transmitting apparatus. At the same time, a receiving station was placed at the Eiffel Tower in Paris through the courtesy of the French Government, who, notwithstanding the war in which they were engaged, did us this great favor. Other receiving stations were installed at San Diego and Vallejo in California, at Darien on the Isthmus of Panama, and at Honolulu on the Hawaiian Islands. To each of these points we sent experts and the necessary receiving apparatus developed and constructed in our laboratories. In September, 1915, articulate speech was successfully received at all of the stations except in Paris, and the following month speech was received at that station through the babel of radio telegraph communication, incident to the World War, which then filled the ether. The war, however, made the conditions for further experimental work so difficult that, with this achieve-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment, further transatlantic telephone experiments were laid to one side for the time and were not resumed until after the conclusion of hostilities.

At the end of the war our experiments were resumed and in order to make a trial, with all of the commercial conditions present and with the complications incident to two-way working, in July, 1920, the Bell System established regular radio telephone communication between the coast of California and Catalina Island, and for about three years worked this service continuously and satisfactorily, handling, by means of it, commercial business to and from Catalina Island, where, until this system was installed, there was no telephone connection. By July, 1923, this radio link had served its purpose. It was therefore discontinued and a submarine cable substituted for it. The experience gained, combined with the long distance experiments already made, justified a confident approach to the commercial transatlantic radio problem.

In the first part of 1923 a demonstration of radio telephony, by means of newly designed apparatus, was made, sending from the United States and receiving at a station which we had installed for the purpose near London. This demonstration was made to a group of British Post Office officials and to newspaper men assembled in London. Following it, the British appointed an advisory committee on transatlantic radio telephony to advise the Postmaster-General of Great Britain on the whole question. Its report was favorable. By January, 1926, the British Post Office had completed their sending station at Rugby, and we had built a receiving station at Houlton, Maine. Then, for the first time, there was available as a whole the system necessary for two-way transatlantic talking.

By March, 1926, two-way talking demonstrations were given to the press of both countries. Many further questions, technical, operating and of a business nature, remained to be worked out, but these were all duly solved, and on January 7 for the first time in the history of the world the telephone systems of the two countries, separated by the waters of a great ocean, were joined together, and another of the limitations which nature has placed on the extension of telephone communication was overcome.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IV

On the disembarkation of the Persians at Marathon, in 490 B.C., "Pheidippides the courier was sent to Sparta immediately to solicit assistance; and such was his prodigious activity that he performed this journey of one hundred and fifty miles, on foot, in forty-eight hours."

Rome maintained her communication, in times of stress, with such important seaports as Alexandria, by fast galleys rowed by hundreds of slaves moving in time with the rhythmic beating of the gong of the hortator and spurred on by the lashes of the whips in the hands of his assistants.

Then communication was incident to transportation and dependent upon its methods.

If we now pass over twenty centuries to the end of the American Revolution, we find that upon the surrender of Yorktown (October 19, 1781)—

"Lieutenant-Colonel Tilghman, of Washington's staff, bore the glad news northward as fast as horse could travel. He reached Philadelphia after midnight of the 24th, and the city watchman proclaimed the tremendous tidings."

Five days to carry from Yorktown to Philadelphia, then the capital of the young Nation, a distance of three hundred miles, news of thrilling and vital importance.

Nor is the story of communication over water a different one. On Christmas Eve, 1814, the Commissioners met for the last time to conclude the War of 1812, and immediately a messenger started for a ship ready to carry him to America. The first news of the signing of the treaty reached New York on February 11, 1815, and three days later it reached Washington; about seven weeks to transmit this news from Ghent to Washington. In the mean time, on January 8, 1815, two weeks after the termination of the war, the Battle of New Orleans was fought, and news of this reached Washington on February 4.

Except for such systems as semaphores, heliographs, flag signals and carrier pigeons, never used except in a limited way and for special purposes, communication was still fettered to transportation.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

V

Even then, however, the dawn of the day of communication was beginning to glow. By a brilliant series of discoveries, the scientists of this country and of Europe were developing the fundamental facts of electricity, the agency that was to break the shackles that fastened communication to transportation. About 1840 came the pioneer commercial application of telegraphy, and from this start, through the extension of land lines and submarine cables, all of the principal places of the world were tied together, and at last communication was independent of transportation and its limitations, and the speed of communication was no longer dependent upon distance.

But still communication had one serious limitation. How great it was, no one realized at the time. Communication whether by letter or telegraph must be by written message and not by the "spoken word." Our natural means of communicating with each other when together could not be used when we were separated by as much as a few hundred feet, and conversation by any of the then existing instrumentalities of communication was impossible.

VI

In 1876 Alexander Graham Bell first demonstrated his newly invented telephone. Writing of it in 1878, the year of the opening of the first small and simple exchange, he said:

> It is conceivable that cables of telephone wires could be laid underground, or suspended overhead, communicating by branch wires with private dwellings, country houses, shops, manufactories, etc., uniting them through the main cable with a central office where the wire could be connected as desired, establishing direct communication between any two places in the city. Not only so, but I believe in the future wires will unite the head offices of telephone companies in different cities, and a man in one part of the country may communicate by word of mouth with another in a distant place.

Then came the problem of making an actuality of this prophecy of Bell's.

Telephone instruments must be improved to make the speech clearer and more powerful.

Telephone lines must be developed to carry the speech currents

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to greater and greater distances and to permit of the construction of the greater and greater numbers of wires needed.

Means must be developed to permit of communication under conditions that make the use of wires impracticable.

Telephone switchboards must be developed to permit of making promptly and accurately the greater number of connections.

Telephone costs must be kept down, in spite of the increasing complexity of the system growing out of the increase in the number of telephones, and this increase in numbers must be realized.

This work has been and is going on continuously, and how well it has been done is testified to by the fact that today our range of communication by telephone is from the Atlantic to the Pacific and from the northern snows to the Gulf of Mexico; it includes Cuba and Canada and part of Mexico, and now Great Britain. At last the "spoken word" has assumed its place in communication.

VII

Well do I remember the wonder of my first talks across the Atlantic, and especially the thrill of one of them. I had been to London in November, 1926, to negotiate for the telephone connection between the two countries. For two weeks I had worked with the officials, and it was a busy and a pleasant two weeks. I then returned to this country, and went to my suburban home. The following morning, at about half-past eight, my telephone bell rang and I answered, expecting to hear from one of my fellow townsmen. A voice said: "This is the transatlantic telephone operator. London is calling you." And next I heard the voice of our London representative, just as though he were but a few miles away, asking if I was well and if my trip home had been a pleasant one.

VIII

Until about 1840 the only communication between the Old World and the New was by means of sailing ships; then came the steamship, and later the telegraph cable, by both of which written messages are sent. Another tie has now been added, "Voices Across the Sea."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LO! THE POOR CLERIC!

BY THE REV. DR. PERCY T. FENN

A GOOD deal is being said, and written, these days about the theological fog that seems to have penetrated the Church, and to have blinded the eyes of many; and of the appalling indifference to public worship as evidenced by the diminutive and rapidly diminishing congregations, especially among the Protestant denominations. The Church of Rome does not seem to be specially affected. But it cannot be denied that in all the non-Roman churches conditions have arisen in the last twenty-five years which are gradually destroying their efficiency, and effectiveness, and making it difficult, if not impossible, for them to do the work for which they have any right to exist. One of these conditions is the widespread restlessness of the clergy.

There was a time in the history of the Church when a parson's job was of life tenure. It was not an uncommon thing for a man to stay in a parish for thirty, forty, fifty years. He grew to know his people intimately, was consulted by them in all the varied experiences of their lives, and was intensely beloved by them. But that day has passed, and now it is unusual for a man to stay with his people for more than a few years. It is no secret that seven-tenths of the clergy would move on tomorrow if they had an opportunity; they could truthfully say with poor Jo, in *Bleak House:* "I'm always a-moving on. I've always been a-moving on and a-moving on ever since I was born. Where can I possibly move to, more nor I do move?"

And the villainous part of it all is that we gain nothing by moving on. We simply change our hotel, or boarding-house, but we have the same unpalatable diet to digest, the same hard bed to lie on, and precisely the same conditions to face after the first year or two. A grim old professor of pastoral theology in one of our Eastern seminaries used to say to his class: "Gentlemen, don't ever expect to find the ideal parish. You may think you

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have it, but it will be an illusion. It is always this way: The first year, 'Come pussy, here pussy, sweet pussy!'; the second year it will be, 'Poor pussy, poor pussy, poor pussy!', and the third year it will be 'Scat!'."

And most of us think he was about right. This is why we want to keep moving on.

But what is it that we clergy want? Well, it is not Utopia, because we shall never be able to find that. But in many cases we want to get out of hell. For many of us can say with Dante, "We have seen hell." The new theology may succeed in abolishing the future hell—much must depend upon our interpretation of hell—but we wish it would devote its fine scholarship and its splendid energies to the task of abolishing the present hell in which so many of our clergy are compelled to live!

But what is this hell, and what are these conditions which make the clergy so restless, and their lives almost unendurable? First there is their scanty wage. The overwhelming majority of the clergy get scarcely enough to keep body and soul together. They find it impossible to live as decently as the average member of the flock they serve. Our Bishops don't realize this, else such a condition would never be tolerated.

Before the war, God knows, it was bad enough. But salaries were larger then than they are now. At any rate they bought more. Today, the stipends are a little larger in some dioceses; but the slightly increased stipend does not begin to go so far as the smaller stipend did before the war. And yet we are expected to dress neatly, live comfortably, pay our bills promptly, and educate our children.

Another cause of restlessness among the clergy of the Protestant Episcopal Church is found in our divergencies of belief and teaching. We have few Fundamentalists amongst us; but we are divided into "High", "Low" and "Broad". A Low Church parish will sometimes make the mistake of calling a High Churchman, and this, of course, spells disaster after a year or two. Under our present system it is really difficult for a vestry to know what they are getting until the rector has come to live among them. Then, when he begins to change the ceremonial of the parish, and to teach unaccustomed doctrines, there is first resentment, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

then open antagonism. And a house divided against itself cannot stand! The trouble lies in the fact that the Church seems to have no uniformity of teaching, or of ceremonial. We have a Creed, fragrant with antiquity, but no fixity of interpretation. Some of us preach the faith as it has been preached in all the ages; others have imbibed the new learning, and very naturally reject some of the old interpretations. We cannot wonder at this when we remember that some of our Seminaries teach the whole Catholic Faith, whilst others deny much of that Faith. This is true of our Bishops. Some believe and preach the Catholic Faith; others glory in their Protestantism. So is it with our Church press. Some of our papers exist to commend the Faith; others to denounce it.

Then there is our name. We are the Protestant Episcopal Church; so the Protestant-minded clergy and laity are technically justified in fighting for their Protestantism. Yet we all believe that we are not a product of the Reformation, but a branch of the Church which our Lord Himself founded, and which has come down to us from the beginning of Christianity. But how can the Church continue to exist, and to prosper, when she blows hot and cold at the same time? She cannot be both Catholic and Protestant in the commonly accepted interpretation of those terms, because they are mutually exclusive. When we tell our people that we are Catholic they point us to our legal name, and we are silenced. Of course we can explain the anomaly to ourselves, but not to them.

We have hitherto gloried in our inclusiveness. We have been able to hold those who accept, and those who deny the Faith; those who believe in an ample ritual, and those who reject it. But this has created a spirit that is divisive and destructive, and has seriously impaired our work. There is no other church in Christendom of which this can be said, and there ought not to be. If the Church were to believe in herself, preach a pure Catholicism, and protect her clergy, her growth would be phenomenal. As it is many of us are more or less muzzled, and are compelled to give our people what they think they want. But the task is depressing, paralyzing, and often fatal. A priest whom I was called to succeed in a large parish in one of our Southern cities,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

went down into his cellar, and blew his brains out! He had been rector of that parish for less than seven years, but the burdens imposed upon him were beyond human endurance.

The Methodists, Presbyterians, Baptists and others know what they believe, and they teach it. We know what we believe, but many of us teach it at our peril. But if the Church has a Creed why should not her clergy be allowed to teach it, and to teach it uniformly throughout the Church? If she has a ceremonial to symbolize that teaching, why should not the clergy be permitted to practice it, and be protected by those in authority when they do?

Another cause of restlessness among our clergy, and among the ministers of all the denominations, is the changed conditions and methods of work and worship. In former times men and women went to church to worship God. Now they go, largely, to be entertained. And often, the greater the clerical mountebank, the larger the congregation. The parish, in many instances, has degenerated into a Club, and what the people want is not a spiritually-minded leader, to whom they may go with their sins and their sorrows; but a real, live Manager to gather in the crowd, and the money. A clergyman wrote me recently: "We have made efficiency, organization, and 'pep' our gods; and standardization and methods our sub-gods. Even in the Church 'hustle' and 'go' predominate, and the parish priest who is not on the move, who does not hustle and devise something for his people to do——God save the mark!—is not on his job. Just as long as the Church is the home of prosperous, complaisant, more or less well-to-do Babbitts, just so long will the Cross be crossed with the dollar mark." And what he says is pathetically true, as hundreds of us know from experience.

The final cause of restlessness that occurs to me is the inability of the Church to employ those of her clergy who have come to middle age. The tendency of the Church today is to scrap her older men, or men who have reached their prime and have family responsibilities. In other words the Episcopal and other churches are doing what no business concern would dare to do—luring the finest type of men to give the best years of their life, practically without reward, and then scrap them in middle life!

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

And no church can stay alive which continues to do this inhuman thing.

Now these are some very plain and simple reasons for the restlessness of the clergy, and they call for serious consideration, and drastic treatment. If we are to do the work required of us, and do it happily, something must be done by those in authority. A set of disgruntled, restless, heartbroken clergy will never be able to inspire the people they serve, or gather in the unchurched. And our spiritual rulers ought to be keen enough to see this. Much of the seething discontent of the clergy is unknown save to themselves; they discuss it with each other, but not with their superiors. Some of them have reached the breaking-point; many of them absolutely refuse to encourage young men to offer themselves for the work of the ministry because of what they themselves have had to suffer, and are still suffering. Our Bishops know little about them. They make an annual visitation, and see a crowded church, and they go away with the idea that all is well. But could they but take time to enter sympathetically into the story of their labors, and their sufferings, they would go away with a heavy heart.

When the Church met at the Council of Nicea, in the year 325, to draft the Nicene Creed, it was at the close of the Age of Persecution. In that council there sat men who bore upon their bodies the scars of torture, and of martyrdom. Nearly every man had a tale to tell of suffering and persecution. The age in which they lived required this heroic endurance, and they gladly suffered that the truth might be spread abroad. In theory, the age of persecution has now passed, and we are living in a land in which the Faith may be proclaimed without danger to life or limb. And yet thousands of the best and bravest men the world has ever seen are compelled to endure every sort of mental and spiritual torture and indignity, not at the hands of enemies of the Church, but at the hands of the men and women for whom they are giving their all! This is the irony of our Christian times and country.

It is not with a heart boiling over with my own personal wrongs that I write in this spirit. Personally I have little of which to complain. In a ministry of thirty-eight years I have had more

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

than my share of happiness, pleasures, honors, friends, and successes. I am speaking for the overwhelming majority of the clergy of all denominations, who have been less fortunate than I. I know how they are suffering, and how bitterly they resent these sufferings as altogether needless. They started out with hopefulness and enthusiasm, only to find that a man cannot be free unless he be a genius. He is compelled by his official board to speak the shibboleths which they deliver to him, and he soon finds himself trammeled and handicapped, and shorn of every shred of independence he possessed. A man of pluck, independent spirit and originality, is crippled, bedevilled and anathematized. The average parish wants a safe, conservative man, who will let things be as he finds them, and not worry the people about their sins. And these are the men who get, and keep, our large parishes.

But this is not Christianity, and it can never be. And our clergy know it, and they are eating their very hearts out. Kindness, loyal affection, and whole-souled coöperation in the things that make for righteousness in a community, are rarely found among the members of the parish. A clergyman has as many bosses as he has members, and many of them are hard, domineering, and unkind.

The wonder is not only that men can be found to enter the ministry, but that those who are in will consent to remain where they are! There is only one explanation—these men have a reservoir of joy of which the world knows nothing. But the world outside should not permit these worthy men to be so tortured. If the unchurched can do nothing else, they should cover with opprobrium the people who are guilty of it.

To summarize: If the restlessness and misery of the clergy are to disappear, a sufficient living must be provided for them. They must no longer be kept on the borderland of want.

They must be given intellectual and spiritual freedom to express the truths for which they live, and the Church must declare herself to be behind them in all their work. If she be afraid to declare herself either Catholic or Protestant, let her have the courage to stand by the men who do, and not blast their careers for doing what she is afraid to do.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There must be a better system of promotion than exists in the Church today. A priest from a neighboring diocese wrote me as follows: "The manner in which clergymen are given cure of souls in our Church is nothing short of an unchristian outrage. From my own observation of many years in this diocese I have discovered that the leading places of responsibility are given only to men who have rich wives, or inherit wealth. Riches and social position are the dominant factors, not consecration, eloquence, ability, or brains, in securing a priest a call to any but the poor mission stations."

More adequate provision must be made for the older clergy who are unable to secure remunerative employment. If these have to accept small mission stations, their pitifully small stipend should be supplemented by a grant from the diocesan or general board, so that they may be enabled to live respectably. Above all, they should be pensioned when they reach the age of sixty-five, or after thirty-five years of service, and their pension should be large enough to maintain them. Even as it is, they are assured of their pitiful pension only if their parishes have paid their assessments in full. If a priest and his wife should die just before the retiring age of sixty-eight, all the money paid in for their benefit is forfeited. This may be good business, but it does not sound much like Christianity! And if a priest be forced out of his parish, and cannot get another, he is compelled to pay seven and one-half per cent. per annum, on an imaginary stipend of $1,200, in order to make sure of his pension when the time comes. Fortunately, many men die before they are eligible for this miserable dole.

The world needs brave, self-sacrificing men today as much as—perhaps more than—ever before in its history. At its best, it is a call to the heroic, the adventurous, the unselfish. Our young men who possess these qualities in their fullness will respond to this call if the Church will do her duty, and provide for and protect them. If she should fail in this, her doom is sure, for the handwriting is already upon the wall.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"EAST IS EAST, AND WEST IS WEST"

BY KENGI HAMADA

In a feverish effort to seek a satisfactory solution to the exasperating race problems that confront citizens on the western borders of America, so much has been said and written with veiled intimations, and denied with equal astuteness, in connection with the relative superiority of the peoples of the Orient and the Occident, that perhaps it would be well worth while to delve into the enigma of misconstrued fundamentals and excavate the truth. The truth, I think, will be disappointing, or at least unconvincing, to those irreconcilables possessing a preconceived notion on the subject, for it will reveal the unromantic fact that there is no such a thing as collective superiority or inferiority in mental properties as designated by race. The crux of the problem lies merely in a difference of viewpoints, each group imagining itself to be superior to the other because each regards the other's qualities and deficiencies with its own particular set of goggles; and the present attempt is made to illustrate this point by resorting to a means that affords the greatest insight into the psychology of life—the drama.

Taking the silent drama as a criterion, because it reaches the greatest number of people, the average American audience generally looks upon tragedy with disfavor, preferring the plays that close with a happy ending. This penchant reflects the mood, the philosophy and the moral fibre of the American people.

The Japanese people, on the other hand, have as yet made very inconsiderable progress along comedy lines. Plays of a tragic character have a greater appeal to them, and the development of the Japanese stage has been characterized almost wholly by the advancement made in the fields of tragedy; so much so that tragedy has virtually become synonymous with drama. Obviously, this apparently morbid characteristic of the Japanese stage reflects the spiritual aspects of the Japanese mind.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Judged by American standards, this spiritual manifestation leads inevitably to the assumption that the Japanese people are a race of fatalists who revel in the suffering of others. Decidedly, in the eyes of a race so optimistic as the Americans, this attribute in the Japanese mind must be both abhorrent and destructive, for its contribution to art, however profound, can scarcely be considered beneficial for the national weal, handicapped as it is by the fact of its serving unequivocally the ends of moral retardation. To one, however, whose whole philosophy of life has been nurtured in an environment saturated with American ideals, yet sufficiently conscious of the fruits of his traditional background to waive all indictments prompted by a mind prejudiced against the Oriental point of view, it does not appear to be so bad as that.

This diversity of opinion, in my estimation, is merely the result of observing the subject from different angles. The American people are prone to attach an unwholesome interpretation to tragedies and to those who delight in tragedies, because in rendering their verdict they concentrate their line of judgment almost entirely on the theme of the story, and hence on the philosophy it expounds. To them, the thing of superlative importance in a dramatic presentation lies in its appeal to the human heart; in the profound meaning it attempts to convey; in the power it possesses in moulding aright the destinies of wavering souls. This theme, however, must be presented in the form of a diversion, not a preachment. To be worth while and successful, a play must amuse as well as point the way.

All of which, in my opinion, is as it should be. It is, moreover, eminently consonant with the spirit of progress; and it can be said without fear of contradiction that this optimistic phase of mind largely accounts for the colossal strides which Americans have made in many fields of worthy endeavor.

But here we must, if anything savoring of an impartial judgment is to be rendered, be careful not to let our sense of vanity lead us into the erroneous belief that all exotic ideas that are not attuned with the American standard are wrong and undesirable. Very often the element of undesirability creeps in because the observer, through an incomplete or faulty comprehension of the subject, imagines it to be there. If, in the case of the Japanese

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

people, the cultivation of the art of appreciating the drama were effected along lines similar to the American standard, then it would be plainly manifest that the Japanese preference for tragic plays was too morbid to be wholesome. But it is not, and in this diversity of taste we find the keynote to the right understanding of each other's points of view.

When conceived by the Japanese mind, the thing of foremost essentiality in a drama lies, in the first place, in the skill with which the intangible story fabric is brought to life. True, the story must possess qualities *par excellence*, and the Japanese have their own conception of what constitutes an excellent story; but the thing that grips their interest is, above all, the histrionic skill of the interpreter. Such considerations as the magnetic appeal of the story, the perfection of its phraseology, etc., are of comparatively lesser significance, and their value is determined only in proportion to how effectively they aid the interpreter's art. And it must be conceded that, in this connection, a play with a tragic vein offers far greater possibilities than a comedy.

A good story is always interesting to read, but good acting is, in many cases, merely good art. Art can be superb and yet uninteresting. Uninteresting, at any rate, to the average layman who is not sufficiently versed in its esoteric features to appreciate its fine points. The Japanese have merely cultivated the leisure, which Americans on the whole for obvious reasons have not, to be interested in uninteresting art. It is a common occurrence in Japan for people of all classes to attend the same performance night after night despite their familiarity with the play and its obvious results, much as a Frenchman or an Italian patronizes the same opera continually without tiring, for the thing that sustains the interest here is the finished artistry of the artists and not the appeal of the story.

In the second place, the Japanese people do not profess to regard the *Pollyanna* theme with such enthusiastic faith as the Americans do, largely because realism is more palatable to their dramatic taste, and consequently they are, as a group, not much given to illusions. This trait is conspicuously in evidence in the vast and unparalleled popularity attained by *Hototogisu*, a masterpiece of realism created by the mind of Japan's foremost novel-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ist, Tokutomi Kenjiro. *Hototogisu* is a tragedy but, unlike many Western tragedies, it is so full of loving tenderness and human sympathy that all traces of morbidity which, to the Western mind, are inseparably associated with a tragedy, are submerged by its obvious appeal. And the appeal is there because it is wholly devoid of cheap sentimentality and reflects so frankly and realistically the spirit of one phase of Japanese life.

Many Westerners, in interpreting the East, have confounded realism with fatalism, but it is contended that there is a world of difference between visualization of the truth and a fatuous submission to an adamantine figment of the brain. We in America are prone to believe that realism contains little or no dramatic value. Realism is merely a reflection of everyday life, and only by proper treatment can we make it dramatic. Our treatment consists in striving to show that every obstacle in the path of virtue can be overcome, even if we have to resort to miracles when every other logical means fails to turn the trick. In short, our idea of a good story consists in depicting life, not as it really is, but as we really want it to be. The Japanese people, on the other hand, have been accustomed to portray life with all its emotional possibilities and human limitations and depend upon the skill of the portrayal for its appeal.

The theme has its place in a Japanese fictional presentation, but here again the Japanese taste differs essentially from the American in that, whereas in America love is paramount and womanhood is glorified with courageous and death-defying loyalty, in Japan the basis of its reckoning is built upon the conviction that the affairs of the State, the Clan and the Family come before the interests of the individual. This conviction may or may not be sound. Suffice it to say that it has been nurtured in the belief that an individual is only a part of a whole, and that the proper method of developing the individual is to develop the individual in relation to the whole. In this method there is unified effort, and it is believed that in unity there is strength. This, obviously, is a direct anthithesis of the American philosophy which permits every individual to develop himself in accordance with his own inherent power and acquired knowledge, and which believes that in a union of well-developed individuals there is strength.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There is no sentimental differentiation between the sexes in Japan, the interests of both men and women being in general regarded on a basis of strict equality. This accounts for the fact that the problem of sex consciousness has seldom been exploited in Japan. Aside from the negligible works of a few modern writers who have traveled abroad and assimilated an over dose of the Western ideals of a lesser calibre, the books and plays of that country are singularly free from the lurid sex problems that abound, despite the persistent protests of a decent minority, in the fictional and dramatic productions of America.

It may be contended that life in Japan, as evinced by these disclosures, especially in the world of femininity, permits very little opportunity for the exercise of individual liberties which we in America so highly cherish. But viewed in the light of stoical Japanese psychology, it is extremely problematical whether there is virtue in liberty unrestrained. While the necessity of this enviable privilege for individual and social expansion, when utilized in a manner compatible with dignity and common sense, is cordially recognized, they are nevertheless firm in their belief, seasoned by centuries of sound experience, that there is such a thing as abusing it; and liberty when abused leads to licentiousness and general decadence of the nation's morals. The ignominious fate of Rome, at the apex of her dazzling brilliancy, bears an eloquent testimony to this contention.

The Japanese, as a race, are a serious minded, highly sophisticated people, with a serious, matter-of-fact outlook upon life; capable of abiding love, deep sympathy and heroic sacrifices; building their dreams upon the actualities of existence, and not upon the extravagant imaginings of a vague and uncertain hope.

Now, it may or may not be commensurate with wisdom, as conceived by American standards, to nurture such a psychological make-up, but the fact remains that environmental influences have moulded for the Japanese and for the Americans traditional backgrounds that are distinctly and diametrically at variance with each other.

For this reason, the two races possess points of view on various phases of life that are curiously different, neither of which can with justice be characterized as superior to the other. Their

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

respective civilizations possess distinct advantages that are peculiarly their own, and each lacks in a great measure what the other possesses.

The civilization of Japan is based primarily upon the acquisition of wisdom, and that of America on the acquisition of information. While the former has been cultivating a system of philosophy which teaches mankind to give a full measure of expression to its life and soul, the latter has been developing a science that builds factories, railroads and radios. The moot question is not one of superiority or inferiority, for neither is perfect without the other. The essential thing is that, lacking what the other possesses, neither civilization has yet reached its zenith of development. When the zenith is reached it will inevitably mean a delightful fusion of both. If this principle is borne in mind whenever new ideas, new customs and new traditions are encountered in different corners of this vari-colored globe, it will conduce so much more to the better understanding of, and its resulting respect for, the peoples outside our own kind.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CHEATING AT SOLITAIRE

BY CONSTANCE LINDSAY SKINNER

LITERATURE has familiarized us with the metaphor of the river which gathers a hundred rills into one stream, flows on thus for miles, and then forks, proceeding thereafter in two opposite directions, usually with diminished power if not seldom with increased violence. Of such is the Stream of Life, says many a classic. On contemporary maps this river appears as the Stream of Consciousness; because our literary cartographers of the human scene have been affected by the prevalent passion for turning the simple into complexes, which is born of shallow wading in the sciences. Rescued from jargon and reduced to primer English, what it all means is that nothing remains the same. Sameness reaches inevitably what may be denominated its Pole of Divergence.

The importance of being in fashion leads us to examine our subject first in the light of science. For instance, in our globe's primal era all the elements of a then future life, or consciousness, existed; but in a state of sameness. Sexes and souls, apes and Appenines, radio, Rotarians and radishes, mathematics and cosmetics, muddled and muddied along together indistinguishably for millions of years. In time, each reached its point of divergence and became individualized into mountain or eye cataract as the case might be. With some of the more recently individualized elements of composite Consciousness the habit of divergence has persisted because of certain magnetic forces, as yet only inadequately explained, which continue to draw them together. This is markedly so in the case of the sexes. Although science has now practically accepted the theory that the sexes' pole of divergence is in the realm of psychology, no scientific man has yet been able to stabilize it. Perhaps, like the North Magnetic Pole, it is eternally doomed to waver. As sure a foundation for it as any that has been advanced by scholars, so far, is the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

solitaire deck. Statisticians, census takers, immigration officials, and the like, could eliminate their present crude phraseology by substituting "Do You Cheat at Solitaire?" Extensive meteorological researches in the regions of Polar Divergence indicate that the correct answer in the affirmative is "Female; married or unmarried!" All women cheat at solitaire sometimes; men, never.

Why do women cheat at solitaire?

Seeking a logical answer to this question—though it might circumstantially appear to have none—we are led from the plane of pure science, on which our discussion opened, along little travelled bypaths of history, and then aloft into the glamorous ether where philosophy and metaphysics have their home and where a new species of ethics, mobile and iridescent as the darting erratic chalcopteryx, begins to be. And, as often happens in the search for truth, the first task is to remove a mass of misconceptions. For, strangely, less is really known about the mind of woman than about any other chemical which man employs in his formulæ of joy. Wine, song and stud poker are far better documented. To be sure, there is an immense amount of literature on the subject but, as nearly all of it is based on masculine research, it must be classed as secondary, and not source, material, and is to be used only with the greatest discretion.

While man in all eras has discovered woman to be delectable—this is a sweeping statement but the race itself offers some evidence in support of it—and has frequently rated her as non-escapable, he has failed to recognize her as enduringly *significant*. Yet, as in a half light, he has seen her having *something* to do with Destiny. The Greek conception of the Fates is an illuminating example of man's faulty visualization. Two ladies of the respectable Spartan middle class pass thread to a third, who snips it. (This is the Stream of Life idea beginning, in an age of simple minds, as a thread flowing from a distaff.) But close scrutiny makes it at once apparent to us that the Fates are really doing nothing in particular. The thread passes through their hands as a matter of routine. They have little consciousness and less volition in regard to it. Had the Greek conceived Destiny in a symbol of *five* women—the first selecting and planting the seed and tending

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the flax; and the fifth receiving the snipped-off ends in her lap and crocheting them into antimacassars of original designs—then the Greek had been a seer indeed. Instead, he bequeathed his defective vision to all men who have succeeded him on the earth.

Stepping briskly along this historic bypath, over the dust of the ruined civilizations lying between the Nile and the North River, we arrive overnight at the Middle Ages. Oh, bright sights and sounds of Romance; glint of armor, tinkle of sabre and roundelay! A new theology confers spiritual Knighthood upon brute force. That fair chivalry crowns frail woman with its protective halo can instantly be surmised, because the streets are being torn up in every direction to make room for more moats, and cartloads of great stones creak by incessantly for the building of new cloisters; while in the bazaars, which still smell faintly of the Saracen, the master goldsmith finishes off milady's engraved girdle, deftly, with a police lock. Pagan Fates are not presented here, nor needed; for the actuality itself does away with all necessity for a symbol. Flesh and blood woman, ringed by granite walls and the chased reducer, is weaving glowing threads in designs that are not of her making. So many years have passed since Greece; but, to man, woman is still static mind in so far as he concedes that she is mind at all. Nevertheless, it might somewhat perturb even Lion Heart himself could he read her thoughts while she draws her stout threads about the figure of knightly man in his romantic rôles of lover, warrior, archbishop, prince and Dick of the Road. Into fabrics sufficiently rich and durable to come through the Customs free centuries later as antiques, her bold spirited touch weaves his adventures, now hers at second hand, which are the only adventures she can have if she does not wish to be pointed at by the friars, and by all the other tight-girdled dames who will catch the pulpit's moral cadence and roll it from end to end of the Barony. Even we, looking at her from this distance, can see that she is impatient. Something is eating at the core of her content which will not be cured, as her armored lord fondly believes, by a little family outing on the palfrey. Merely to ride behind him, holding on to his metal waist, will not allay the unrest of her who has begun to dream of action.

Now the bypath leads on to the satin boudoirs of Versailles.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Woman has escaped, in a degree, from former limitations. Far behind her lie both the Spartan Spookery and the cloisters of Charlemagne. Her life is poised on spindly gilt chairs, veiled in *point d'Alençon*, and environed with perfume and political *amours*. Many mirrors, small and great, in carven gold frames, reveal to us how deeply self-study, self-knowledge, now engross her. No longer does she see only a portion of herself and in but one aspect. To use more modern parlance, she gets several different slants on herself at once. She has, so to say, passed over the great psychic span from Fate to Crystal Gazer. Not only can she forsee the impression she will make face to face; she knows the thoughts she will leave behind her. A new epoch opened silently, unmarked by those supposed sentinels of civilization, the historians and the theologians, when woman achieved the view of herself from the back. From that day, at first heedlessly, then more and more contemplatively, she has pushed forward. In short, once woman herself had become willing to leave man behind her, her moral and spiritual leadership was assured. Therefore, how naturally we find the solitaire table placed between two mirrors in these boudoirs! With the commencement of self-knowledge, woman has also discovered the Pole of Divergence! Her mood is partly playful, partly awed; for the suits and several of the cards have names with dread associations. Kings are potent, and often evil. Queens may be jealous. Clubs are unlucky. Spades hint of the grave. Mysterious invisible powers control those bits of pasteboard. Their bane descends on the cheater. Hence, she plays the game honestly.

America! Democracy and mass production of playing cards! The solitaire deck is in hall bedrooms, and Pullmans, in the parlors of Main Street, in city kitchens. Women of all professions and none are playing; but not as women played in the boudoirs of Versailles. Woman today feels no awe of kings nor love of knaves. Let one of them turn up to balk her and she puts him in his proper place. What interest has a queen for her, except as an exhibit from Roumania? She is not superstitious about symbols, titles, or rules. Abreast of her scientific age, as she is, she knows that diamonds, for instance, are discovered by mineralogists, mined by Kaffirs and acquired by psychologists.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Her own fingers testify to a part of this. Living in an era of cut flowers and crematories, spades have no weird terrors for her, nor horticultural associations to make her digress more pleasantly from her purpose. Hearts? They were; but they are passing. Each year there are fewer, even on St. Valentine's Day; and the blank circular peppermint has almost entirely replaced the inscribed lozenge of love which was so expressive in the 'Nineties. Clubs stir not the primordial memory. How completely she has forgotten that a reversed form of marriage by capture ever existed! Her civic activities have already convinced her that the race is only saved by Clubs, not perpetuated. And since no occult powers, other than her own will and fancy, direct the cards, no bane dogs the cheater; so she plays them as she pleases.

She has learned that the perfect pattern exists, and she is allowing no material nor moral obstacles to intervene between her and that perfection. Inevitably her mind, having gained freedom and versatility by smashing inhibitions at solitaire, will advance with increased force and subtlety to the creation of her own patterns. Let man consider that: however helplessly. The Three Fates he invented, plus the two he never guessed, are upon him. In the tapestries which woman will weave hereafter, man —in so far as he may appear at all—will be in complete subjection to her original design of life and society.

Cheating herself! Man cries, watching her palm an ace. He is still as dim-eyed as the Greek. For Mother is not cheating herself, nor is Sister, nor Dearest. Dusky Miranda in the kitchen is not cheating herself when she reads 'em and weeps not but fixes 'em. She is winning against chance, against law and old pedestrian ethics. Oh no! Woman did not shed her distaff and cross the moat only to cheat herself under a liberal Constitution.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TO VOTE OR NOT TO VOTE

BY CATHERINE MITCHELL TALIAFERRO

MUCH talk is current as to why all qualified voters in these United States do not appreciate the franchise and use it. That the quota of those who do vote is only about one-half of those who should, is a fact to be remedied and not one that need cause discouragement. It seems indigenous the world over, for people in general to take little personal interest in *res publicæ* unless there is some great cause to defend, or promote. It has been said, dogs would sleep themselves to death were it not that fleas bite them. So it would seem that voters need to be incited by some such feverish energy-producing act as a fleabite to arouse them from apathy to take active part in politics. Hence campaign issues.

Nobody expressed care as to how many voters voted or did not vote until women were given the franchise. It had been predicted that they would not use it. Those who said, "I told you so," took count to prove their gift of prophesy. It was found that a large percentage of women voters did not use the franchise, which satisfied those who said they would not. But the women were not satisfied. They knew that many women did not want the vote. In fact, a great percentage of women so opposed the right of women to vote as to inhibit wherever and whenever they could the hard work, though they could not prevent the final victory of the zealots. So, it was no surprise to the zealots that many women did not vote, and they now continue by unrelenting endeavor to educate those apathetic sisters to activity in politics.

However, the matter only begins there. Only approximately one-half of male voters vote. Perhaps they did not want suffrage. At any rate they fail to use it. This was not prophesied. A fact is the best proof of itself. All men do not use their voting privilege.

Let us review a bit of political history, come up to the present time, and decide where to go from here.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Women first voted by National franchise in the Presidential election of 1920. The War had brought about a radical change in the social order. Ladies of refinement, culture, highest social contacts and customs, established and carried on centers of entertainment for the soldiers, sailors and marines. To these centers came women and girls from every walk in life. Men and women, alike, were doing something for their country. Women, especially, had changed their habits. Social functions were less elaborate. Entertainment on a purely democratic and impersonal plane was in vogue everywhere. Values changed. Character, ability and willingness to serve were weighed and counted of worth in judgment of patriotism. Before a reversion to type had occurred, the Presidential campaign was on with the League of Nations as the paramount issue. The women could vote, and before returning to strictly domestic life were called to defend the Nation at the ballot box. Division in the ranks came through following the standards of the two major political parties. Both sides had a sentimental appeal. Membership in the League of Nations would end war. Membership in the League of Nations would drag us into war. Wounded soldiers were coming home. Gold Star mothers were weeping. There was Peace, but it might not last. The fate of the world depended on the political battle then being fought in this country.

To test woman's ability as a politician, the women were given the "dirty work" to do in all parties. Being accustomed to washing dishes and sweeping off the back porch, they worked like beavers, day and night, in season and out of season. They electioneered everybody with whom they came in contact. The butcher, the baker, the candlestick maker, the iceman, the milkman, the janitor, the bootblack, and their wives and daughters, were urged to vote. They made friends, they made enemies; they commanded respect, they lost respect; but what of it? It was a patriotic duty for everybody to vote, and, as to be a slacker in war work was disgrace, so it was equal disgrace to be a slacker in the duties of citizenship.

The men were surprised. The women could work. They could deliver votes. They could be of value to parties. But something for nothing is a bad bargain. Positions in the or-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ganization would be a just reward for work well done. Were there enough honors to divide? Investigation disclosed that only about half of the women voted anyway. Did it really make much difference in the outcome?

No party bid for the women. Left to decide party affiliations for themselves, they set out to study both sides, or all sides. Non-partizan study groups were formed. Women were shown a strange thing. They were told that the two major parties claimed to be as distinct as black from yellow. To prove them as alike as two peas, one was told to stand at the yellow side and look through yellow glasses at the black. It looked green. Then the same one was taken to a position on the black side and told to look through black glasses at the yellow. It looked green. The point was proved. Both were the same color. Then how could one choose? What difference did it make how one voted, or whether one voted or not? A discouraging dilemma was present. But the way out was shown to be easy. Vote for a Candidate. Never mind where he comes from, any party or no party; with following or without following; vote for a Candidate and prove independence of thought. "Oh, yes, George Washington did say this country would have to be governed by parties; but that was a long time ago!"

The next call to the polls was in 1922, when Governors, some United States Senators and Representatives were elected. Indeterminate women voted split tickets in many instances and in other instances did not vote at all or did not vote a whole ticket on account of the candidates. The reaction on the part of the men was that women could not be counted upon. The woman's vote was unreliable, vacillating, difficult to handle. In 1924 the women were left a little more to themselves, and there came the realization that efforts must be made to urge men to vote in order to steady the party ships. In 1926 there came a sort of "*S-s-s-sh!*" with regard to women and stronger efforts to get out the man vote.

This sketch is done in broad strokes. Now as to details. Different conditions in different localities. Then we will have got to the present.

There are groups of sincere, earnest and untiring women working for their parties. The word "for" is used advisedly, as

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

women had not yet been fully assimilated into the parties. It is still necessary in some places for them to finance their own part of the organization. There are also sincere women who are non-partisan. All groups are making earnest efforts to learn what it means to be good citizens; to understand local and national conditions and international affairs. Study clubs, lectures, individual research, papers, talks, etc., indicate an enormous amount of energy put forth in the desire to learn. The need to continue the process of education, to awaken in women the force of moral obligation to take part in the government by voting, is steadily going on between election campaigns as well as when the fight is at white heat.

Are the men carrying on as well? If so, then the National election in 1928 will see more votes cast everywhere. It is not enough to say that magazines, newspapers and broadcasting keep the people informed so that they should know and comprehend the political moves. This is only true for those of us who make a profession of keeping informed, but somehow, the Sports Editor; the Comic Supplement Editor; the Cross-Word Puzzle Editor, make their pages so very entertaining that one cannot altogether be blamed for not reading editorials and news that is making political history.

It is not the purpose of this article to preach, teach or do more than present an observational point of view, but a moderate injection of statistics in easy terms of percentage will not, I am sure, cause the reader to stop before he gets to the end.

It is generally stated that fifty-two per cent. of the voters use the franchise. Examining the population as a whole, perhaps we should not expect more than eighty per cent. to vote! The qualified voter is one who has attained twenty-one years of age, is a native or naturalized citizen of the country, exempt from criminal charge, has lived in a certain voting precinct the required time, and can take the literacy test. Thousands of Negroes who are qualified voters are not incited by patriotism or campaign issues to vote. Other thousands of qualified voters in large cities and remote, scattered rural districts have not the faintest grasp of Constitutional, representative government, and so are indifferent. There are still other thousands whose meager

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

knowledge of the English language makes it difficult for them to appreciate our ideals, but who are qualified voters. Without exact figures at hand, one might fairly suppose that the aggregate of these groups sum up to twenty per cent. of the total population of persons twenty-one years of age and over, leaving eighty per cent. who might be expected to vote. As fifty-two per cent. of one hundred is sixty-five per cent. of eighty, we are not so apathetic as we might at first seem. However, the thirty-five per cent. who disappoint us must be brought up to the ballot box, and when this is done, we can press on to poll the votes of the other twenty per cent. of the whole. How is this to be accomplished?

A good old maxim, obeyed, will bring results: "Not only strike while the iron is hot, but keep it hot by striking." Keep party organizations together in the study of politics between campaigns. Teach honest statements of fundamental party principles. I have tried this recipe with good results. Even in the thick of a political campaign, I have always found time for "parlor talks" on the issues, giving the reasons for promoting certain measures and answering such other questions as individuals wanted to know. Such personal contact has thrown much light on why many voters do not vote. They do not understand exactly what representative government means. Few realize that an election such as we had in the autumn of 1926 was a National election in choosing our representatives in both Houses of the Federal Congress, and that such choice of men to handle National and International affairs is as important as choosing a President and Vice-President. When once the moral responsibility of expressing approval or disapproval of candidate or party is aroused, it generally bears fruit. Then, as the individual begins to feel a sort of personal responsibility for "his" representative, he begins to take notice of what that representative is doing in the halls of legislation. He also learns that adhesion of representatives on sound party principles makes for better legislation and cleaner politics than for an isolated "candidate" to work without friends against all foes.

One particular woman's political club has an interesting custom of inviting the representative of that district in the State legisla-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ture to give the workings of the inside of that body, explaining the whys and wherefores of measures that the newspapers do not always give. This also gives the representative an opportunity to keep himself before his constituency. Another club corresponds with United States Senators and Congressmen to learn why they take certain stands on bills, and are thus well informed before advocating or denouncing a bill. These instances show what can be done to keep the voter interested in the functions of government.

The experiment of using the radio in place of personal speeches has proven inefficient in getting out the vote. The radio audience is usually in passive mood, unless dancing to jazz music. An uninteresting speech is cut off for something entertaining. Should more interesting speakers follow the bore, it is rare that one listening in reverts to the station where the uninteresting speaker was heard. And there is lack of the contagion of personal enthusiasm to incite one to get out and work and go to the polls and vote, whereas to attend a good political rally, "talk it over" with others on the way home, shake hands with the speakers and feel oneself personally honored by contact with the great and near-great, will do more to get out the vote than all impersonal methods.

The greatest patriotic duty for every citizen in time of peace is to help those who do not feel the responsibility of civic duty to awaken to it and to the enjoyment of exercising it. Party affiliation makes for coöperation and team work and a better understanding of our system of government. No one ever cleaned a house by deserting it to insects and vermin.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LARGE SCALE DRAMA PRODUCTION

BY J. BROOKS ATKINSON

I

In ten or fifteen years the bigwigs will be grinding out their solemn lucubrations on the Middle 'Twenties in the Drama. With that additional perspective they can relate the current plays to life in general, and no doubt draw a very pretty moral. At present we can only guess. Immersed in a vague transitional period in thought and manners, bewildered by much that is ephemeral, we scarcely recognize ourselves. Just "whither we are drifting", in the stale platitude, only the good Lord knows.

As always, the truth lies somewhere between the excesses of calamity howlers and the mystic hopes of prophets. For, it seems to me, the proposals on both sides betray special interests rather than the abstract truth about the stage. Those who attend the theatre spasmodically and who are chiefly engrossed in the cross currents of modern thought deplore with reason the artificiality of the theatre, the decline in acting, the superficial plots and the moral licenses of the themes. They can point to days when the theatre was grander. Great names burn glowingly in their minds.

But those who are devoted to the theatre as their chief diversion are constantly amazed at the vitality, ingenuity, brilliance and even the daring of what they see. Is it not closer to life than ever before? Is it not more piercing in its illumination of daily existence, more vivid, more unerring, swifter, neater? Although the grand manner of acting has largely disappeared, because sweeping drama has dropped out of fashion, the average acting is far more competent—as slender and true as modern architecture; and surely the mechanics of staging are vastly superior. Shamed by the resourcefulness of the Theatre Guild, Winthrop Ames, Arthur Hopkins, the recent Neighborhood Playhouse group and the fine achievements sponsored by Morris Gest, nearly every

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

producer sets his stage well and lights it intelligently. For the production of small-gauge plays, written from observation and designed for the trade, the current theatre is ably equipped. *Saturday's Children*, *Burlesque*, *The Second Man*, *Broadway*, *The Trial of Mary Dugan*, slip across the footlights without splintering a fragment of their stories. In the more complicated sphere of imaginative works, like the Ames revival of *The Mikado*, or musical extravaganzas like *Rio Rita*, the versatility of staging is nothing short of genius. Burning colors, bits of comedy, musical serenades, patter, chorus embroideries, whirl across the stage like a phantasmagoria—like that strange, enchanting, spirited art which is the theatre. No art is dead or degraded that can summon such magic from tools of the trade. Product of the machine age, it is nevertheless soft, beautiful and alluring.

II

What are the average achievements of all this skill and equipment? In the field of the spoken drama, as distinguished from musical entertainments and revues, the products are consistently trifling. Anyone who attends the theatre night after night cannot escape the suspicion that the plays merely keep the machinery in motion. In New York, for instance, we have about seventy major theatres, eating off their heads in ground rental. Each theatre has expensive stage equipment that must not lie idle. Nearly every producer has also a staff of assistants whose abilities must be properly employed. Every unproductive moment, therefore, is costly; and the clamor is for a piece to "keep the theatres lighted". From the Olympian point of view the cart runs far ahead of the horse, and the art about which the poet singeth is purely incidental. The theatre is industry; it is a profession in only a few instances.

In the circumstances one is not surprised to find that the most numerous plays (and the most profitable) are those that make efficient use of the machinery. If the effect is not ennobling, it is, I think, entertaining. As with the musical productions, it is more nimble than the equipment, and more versatile than what we contemptuously brand as the "machine-made"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

play. *Broadway*, by Philip Dunning and George Abbott, illustrates the product in every respect. Technically a melodrama, it recounts the lurid affairs of bootleggers and cabaret entertainers with the usual gun play, clash of interests, jealousies, treacheries and revenges. The dialogue is compounded of short sentences; it is packed with vulgarities. The action moves at express train speed; there is noise, and frantic excitement. Attractive as all these elements may be, they do not fully account for the extraordinary popularity of the drama—for more than a year of uninterrupted playing in New York and numerous secondary companies in America and abroad. Beyond the facts of the story *Broadway* represents the stage in an efficient use of acting, directing and playwrighting. Almost for the first time on the purely commercial stage it succeeds in bringing a performance to flaming life, not by blindly following the directions of the author's text, but by employing the actors as phrases in an orchestrated score or as designs in a large pattern; and then expressing them completely in terms of synthetic motion. It emerges as a blaring, variegated processional of Broadway life, a common story against the lithographic background of all that shrill, amorphous "racket". Quite apart from the fable of Steve Crandall, Roy Lane and Billie Moore, it sets in fast motion the garish pageantry of the night clubs, and, like all comprehensive drama, it makes for the time being a microcosm of its vibrant material. It gives us that peculiar, glamorous sensation which is the theatre.

III

After *Broadway* had become the "hit" of the last season—a "wow" in the argot of the trade—imitations of that technique sprinkled the mendicant stage for many months. Some of the most inept, like the flabby *Ballyhoo*, are remembered only for their pathetic hopelessness. But *The Barker*, by Kenyon Nicholson, recaptured the same mood in a picturesque melodrama of the American "mud-show", or peripatetic carnival; and *Spread Eagle*, staged by the producer of *Broadway*, carried the same theatrical versatility into the sphere of sensational international politics.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Although the imitations of any art never convey the freshness of the original, and seem stagnant on that account, further explorations always pique interest. Obviously, *Broadway* has stimulated the imagination of directors and producers, and it has quickened their daring. They have sought with conspicuous success to reproduce the same stirring theatrical excitement by other means. *The Spider* has twisted a dull story into a sensation by planting members of the cast in orchestra chairs, impounding the audience, sending shivers of apprehension down the spine by discharging pistol shots over the heads of innocent playgoers—in general playing fast and loose from orchestra to stage.

What Bayard Veiller, author of *Within the Law* and *The Thirteenth Chair*, has done with *The Trial of Mary Dugan* seems to me especially interesting. For years the sniffing intellectuals, the fastidious dabblers in art, have dreamed of plays that weld the audience and the actors into one being—plays in which the passive interest of the audience becomes an active force in the production. Reinhardt and Gemier have succeeded here in varying degrees.

In *The Trial of Mary Dugan* the frankly commercial stage has employed that device with capital results. The stage, set to represent a court room, is always exposed. When the audience begins to collect for the evening performance, scrubwomen are cleaning the furniture and a policeman, with his feet perched on the attorney's table, is smoking a cigarette and reading a newspaper, completely oblivious of playgoers in orchestra seats. Between the acts, which represent temporary adjournments of the court, some indigent functionary calmly munches his luncheon in the middle of the stage. Throughout the play the audience represents the jury. Although I do not consider the effect completely successful, for the traditional division between audience and players is never quite bridged, the scheme does broaden the scope of acted drama. And, as usual, the journeyman practitioners of the theatre accomplish their object more effectively than the high priests of art. They may be sluggish in conjuring new ideas from the welter of routine producing; but they attack new ideas with biting, resourceful skill.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IV

Are these the mice born of so imposing a mountain? By and large they are. When producers require nothing beyond the employment of idle machinery, and a stinging sensation, the thoughts of dramatists never stir from the old, familiar patterns of melodrama. Audiences fatten on vulgarity; the box office looks merry. When the same versatility in theatrical excitement reaches out to finer stuff, it lays a deadly hand on ideas and dreams. In *Four Walls*, for instance, George Abbott, the animating wizard of *Broadway* and *Spread Eagle*, has imposed his craftsmanlike skill upon a play of characters and ideas by Dana Burnet. I do not know exactly how much vitality Mr. Abbott has brought to Mr. Burnet's script; I suspect that he has made a weak play seem strong in the theatre. But not without temporizing the ideas. *Four Walls* seems to propose that "the truth shall set you free". After spending five years in jail, an East Side gang leader determines to keep himself free, not physically but intellectually, by acting the truth in every detail of his life. His past engulfs him before he realizes it. Suddenly, through a series of impulsive actions, he finds himself in the arms of the law once more. He has killed his rival in Grand Street accidentally, or perhaps in self defense; but you realize that his troubles with the police are begun again. At any rate, believing that the truth will set him free, even though he may be confined in jail, he delivers himself to the police voluntarily and he promises to save his soul by telling the full truth. It is a splendid dramatic idea. But ethical principle does not blend well with theatrical excitement. To shoot *Four Walls* across the footlights briskly the authors and direction have crowded it with pungent local color, strident scenes between political hangers-on, a gang war, lightning changes in setting and mood. In fact, thought is so soundly trounced by theatre that neither comes through the skirmish unharmed. In this instance of an unusually engaging play, splendidly acted, theatrical versatility has not forced dramatic ideas across the footlights. It has forced them to one side. The result is vaguely disappointing: the means have not matched the creative principles of the play.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If all this is "the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth", as the witnesses in *The Trial of Mary Dugan* reiterate, it follows logically that the mechanics of the stage, the skill in acting and directing, surpass the written drama in forcefulness. So far scarcely a dramatist has been strong enough to subdue the equipment to his own devices. Most of the plays of character and idea, like *Saturday's Children* or *The Second Man*, still employ the simpler three-act forms. When they run to the looser patterns of picaresque stories, like *In Abraham's Bosom* or *Pickwick*, they miss the exhilaration essential to the stage.

Only one dramatist is as big as the theatre, or bigger. Only Eugene O'Neill sees the new resources of the theatre in terms of a glittering opportunity, as promises of a fillip to the imagination. In most of his plays Mr. O'Neill has bent the form to the guiding motive or dominant tone of his play. *The Great God Brown* employed masks—not quite successfully—to distinguish the relative qualities of truth, or to show the sources of the misunderstanding that warps human relationships born of affection. His next three plays, *Marco Millions*, *Lazarus Laughed*, and *Strange Interlude*, have not yet reached the stage; and from reading them we can only estimate their power to transport audiences beyond the concrete boundaries of daily experience. But in the truest sense they are imaginative and creative. They transcend reality. They require masks, chorals, singing, instrumental music, vast panoramas and pageants, dancing, orchestrated performing, acting in the grand manner; and they will test the skill of the stage as none of our native plays has ever done.

Mr. O'Neill's undisputed dominance of the American stage must seem rather tiresome even to him. But the truth is that he is peerless. No one else is so protean an influence in shaping the theatre into a creative expression of beauty. Of all our playwrights he alone leads the directors, scene designers and electricians. Accordingly, we still look to him to justify the theatre's amazing resourcefulness. All we need at any time is genius. I suppose we should not be gluttons: we should thank God for one genius at a time. But while the theatre is so rich in possibilities, it is a pity that we cannot see them on every modern stage.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PROTOTYPE OF "THE RAVEN"

BY GEORGE NORDSTEDT

It is not my intention here to prove that Poe was a plagiarist in the common application of that term. I shall simply state my opinion as to the metrical form of one of Poe's most remarkable poems, *The Raven*—a poem which to this day continues to be an object of admiration (even among *vers librists*), not only because of its strange originality, but also for its unique stanzaic structure. This structure, or stanza-form, I propose to analyze a little, comparing it with an old "sacred" poem recently discovered by myself in the city of Boston.

It has been said that "Poe stole the theme, rhythm, and technique of *The Raven* from a certain lunatic in a certain madhouse." This is not so, or the proofs would be forthcoming. R. H. Stoddard points out that if Mrs. Browning had cared to dwell upon the subject of metre, she might have intimated that the measure of *The Raven* (in spite of the difference between them) had evidently been suggested by the measure of her *Lady Geraldine's Courtship*, and might have produced a verbal proof that Poe had read that poem before writing his own. The resemblance between one of her lines and one of his lines is too close to be accidental. Here it is:

> With a rustling stir, uncertain in the air, the purple curtain—
> (Mrs. Browning)

> And the silken, sad, uncertain rustling of each purple curtain—
> (E. A. Poe)

Undoubtedly Poe had read *Lady Geraldine's Courtship* before he wrote *The Raven*. The metre and rhythm of the four first verses of Poe's stanza are exactly the same; and that Poe must have borrowed some of the airy language of the quoted verse can hardly be denied. Innumerable poetasters have borrowed from Poe. "Our verse-founders," writes Oliver Leigh, "will never

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

confess their debts to Poe for ideas, for designs, for word-forms, melody, witchery, etc. For that matter he was not more scrupulous than they are in picking up trifles from owners, less expert than himself in knowing their value, than were Shakespeare and Tennyson, 'Longfellow, and other plagiarists,' as he calls them."

As Kipling says of himself in this happy rhyme:

> When 'Omer smote 'is blooming lyre,
> 'E 'eard men sing on land and sea;
> And what 'e thought 'e might require,
> 'E went and took, the same as me.

But it is not in *Lady Geraldine's Courtship*, nor in Tennyson's *Locksley Hall* that the metrical prototype of *The Raven* is to be found. However, in this connection it is a curious thing to read the following from Poe's *Fifty Suggestions:*

> With the exception of Tennyson's *Locksley Hall*, I have never read a poem combining so much of the fiercest passion with so much of the most delicate imagination, as the *Lady Geraldine's Courtship* of Miss Barrett (Mrs. Browning). I am forced to admit, however, that the latter work *is* a palpable imitation of the former.

Poe was ever morbidly keen on the subject of plagiarism.

Let us see what Poe himself says regarding the stanza-form of *The Raven*. In *The Philosophy of Composition* he writes:

> Of course, I pretend to no originality in either the rhythm or metre of *The Raven*. The former is trochaic—the latter is octametre acatalectic, alternating with heptametre catalectic repeated in the refrain of the fifth verse, and terminating with tetrametre catalectic. Less pedantically, the feet employed throughout (trochees) consist of a long syllable followed by a short; the first line of the stanza consists of eight of these feet, the second of seven and a half (in effect two-thirds), the third of eight, the fourth of seven and a half, the fifth the same, the sixth three and a half. Now, each of these lines taken individually has been employed before, and what originality *The Raven* has is their combination into stanzas; nothing even remotely approaching this combination has ever been attempted . . .

And now let us quote the stanza Poe himself said was the most perfect one in *The Raven*, the sixteenth:

> "Prophet!" said I, "Thing of evil!—Prophet still, if bird or devil!
> By that heaven that bends above us—by that God we both adore—
> Tell this soul with sorrow laden if, within the distant Aidenn,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It shall clasp a sainted maiden whom the angels name Lenore—
Clasp a rare and radiant maiden whom the angels name Lenore."
Quoth the Raven, "Nevermore".

Compare this stanza with the stanzas of the following poem, written by an unknown poet and discovered by myself in an old volume of fugitive poetry which I came upon by chance and bought some time ago at a second-hand bookstore on Cornhill, Boston:

EVERMORE

I beheld a golden portal in the visions of my slumber,
And through it streamed the radiance of a never-ending day;
While angels tall and beautiful, and countless without number,
Were giving gladsome greetings to all who came that way.
And the gates, for ever swinging, made no grating, no harsh ringing,
Melodious as the singing of one that we adore;
And I heard a chorus swelling, grand beyond a mortal's telling,
And the burden of that chorus was hope's glad word—Evermore!

And as I gazed and listened, came a slave all worn and weary,
His fetter-links blood-crusted, his dark brow clammy damp,
His sunken eyes gleamed wildly, telling tales of horrors dreary,
Of toilsome strugglings through the night amid the fever swamps.
Ere the eye had time for winking, ere the mind had time for thinking,
A bright angel raised the sinking wretch, and off his fetters tore.
Then I heard the chorus swelling, grand beyond a mortal's telling,
"Pass, brother, through our portal, thou'rt a freeman evermore!"

And as I gazed and listened, came a mother wildly weeping—
"I have lost my hopes for ever—one by one they went away;
My children and their father the cold grave hath in keeping,
Life is one long lamentation, I know nor night nor day!"
Then the angel softly speaking,—"Stay, sister, stay thy shrieking,
Thou shall find those thou art seeking beyond that golden door!"
Then I heard the chorus swelling, grand beyond a mortal's telling,
"Thy children and their father shall be with thee evermore!"

And as I gazed and listened, came one whom desolation
Had drived, like a helmless bark, from infancy's bright land!
Who ne'er had met a kindly look—poor outcast of creation—
Who never heard a kindly word, nor clasped a kindly hand.
"Enter in, no longer fear thee: myriad friends are here to cheer thee—
Friends always to be near thee; there no sorrow sad and sore!"
Then I heard the chorus swelling, grand beyond a mortal's telling,
"Enter, brother; thine are friendship, love, and gladness evermore!"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

And as I gazed and listened, came a cold, blue-footed maiden,
With cheeks of ashen whiteness, eyes filled with lurid light;
Her body bent with sickness, her lone heart heavy laden;
Her home had been the roofless street, her day had been the night.
First wept the angel sadly, then smiled the angel gladly,
And caught the maiden madly rushing from the golden door;
Then I heard the chorus swelling, grand beyond a mortal's telling,
"Enter, sister, thou art pure, and thou art sinless evermore!"

I saw the toiler enter to rest for aye from labor;
The weary-hearted exile there found his native land;
The beggar there could greet the king as an equal and a neighbor;
The crown had left the kingly brow, the staff the beggar's hand.
And the gate, for ever swinging, made no grating, no harsh ringing,
Melodious as the singing of one that we adore;
And the chorus still was swelling, grand beyond a mortal's telling,
While the vision faded from me with the glad word—"Evermore!"

This, then, is the metrical—the stanzaic—prototype of *The Raven*. I shall try to prove, from metrical analysis exclusively, that Poe had read *Evermore* ere he wrote *The Raven*, and that the former inspired him to compose his own poem, which is an imitation of *Evermore* both as to metre, rhythm, stanza-form and rhyme-scheme.

The difference of stanza-form between the two poems is not so great as it appears to be. Poe's stanza consists of six verses, that of *Evermore* of eight. The first five verses of both stanzas are identical, except that Poe runs two heptametres (the fourth and fifth verses) together, and then abruptly ends the stanza with a truncated verse or tetrametre catalectic. Otherwise Poe's metrical analysis would equally well fit the stanza of the unknown poet. It is the latter's rhyme-scheme, however, that proves Poe to be an imitator. Here is *Evermore's* interior rhyme-scheme:

Ere the eye had time for winking, ere the mind had time for thinking,
A bright angel raised the sinking wretch, and off his fetters tore.

And here is *The Raven's:*

Tell this soul with sorrow laden if, within the distant Aidenn,
It shall clasp a sainted maiden whom the angels named Lenore.

The identity is absolute. Poe's stanza, of course, is the more artistic one, having interior rhyme also in the first verse, besides

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the assonance and alliterative melody of the old Scandinavian and Saxon ballads. Poe was too fine an artist to borrow without altering and improving upon the original.

And now, what shall we think of Poe's statement regarding *The Raven's* stanza-form? Did he knowingly write an untruth in the passage: "Nothing even remotely approaching this combination was ever attempted"? Or did Poe really invent the whole of *The Raven's* stanza-form and rhyme-scheme? This I hold to be absolutely impossible. Taking everything into consideration, such a coincidence could not happen even once in eternity. Consequently, if Poe did not imitate the unknown poet, the latter must have imitated Poe. Is this the case?

Against this possibility there is, I think, internal evidence in the unknown's poem itself. The language, the punctuation, are of a literary epoch before Poe. The second stanza could hardly have been written after the abolition of slavery in America in 1865. True, Poe died on October 7, 1849, four years after he wrote *The Raven;* so there would have been ample time for someone to imitate the stanza-form ere the Civil War did away with chattel slavery in the South. But it is not necessary even to consider this, for *Evermore* was not written in this country. The volume I happened to find was printed at Stoneham, near Aberdeen, Scotland, in 1878. The publisher says in his preface: "I take the present opportunity to return thanks to friends who have rendered me assistance in collecting, and also to those Editors and Publishers who have readily granted permission to include in this selection pieces from their compilations, etc., that are held as copyright." It was probably in one of those "compilations, etc." that Poe came upon *Evermore* at some second-hand bookstore in Philadelphia or New York. The poem must have been written in Scotland or England long before Poe was born, probably at the close of the eighteenth century.

No matter where Poe happened to read *Evermore*, one thing is certain—he saw at a single glance the extreme excellence of the stanza-form and rhyme-scheme. If ever a metromaniac existed, Poe was one. The intense power of the poem struck him mightily, and it is safe to say that he sat thunderstruck with surprise and admiration. Certainly, "nothing even remotely approach-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing this combination was ever attempted," so far in America, that he saw at once. The haunting melody of the refrain, the music of the twice repeated interior rhymes, filled his sensitive soul with immense pleasure. Here was a poem exactly to his liking, written by an unknown. "Evermore"—what a sonorous word at the end of such a stanza! How superior to that celebrated stanza in *The Celestial Country*, written in Latin about 1145 and translated by Dr. John Mason Neale:

> And there is David's fountain,
> And life in fullest glow;
> And there the light is golden,
> And milk and honey flow—
> The light that hath no evening,
> The health that hath no sore,
> The life that hath no ending,
> But lasteth evermore.

That Poe had read the above stanza is certain. And here is another poem he must have been well acquainted with:

> O, sweet and fair! O, rich and rare!
> That day so long ago
> The autumn sunshine everywhere,
> The heather all aglow,
> The ferns were clad in clothes of gold,
> The waves sang on the shore.
> Such suns will shine, such waves will sing
> Forever evermore.
>
> O, fit and few! O, tried and true!
> The friends that met that day.
> Each one the other's spirit knew,
> And so in earnest play
> The hours flew past, until at last
> The twilight kissed the shore.
> We said, "Such days shall come again
> Forever evermore."
>
> One day again, no cloud of pain
> A shadow o'er us cast;
> And yet we strove in vain, in vain,
> To conjure up the past;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Like, but unlike,—the sun that shone,
  The waves that beat the shore,
The words we said, the songs we sung,
  Like,—unlike,—evermore.

For ghosts unseen crept in between,
  And when our songs flowed free,
Sang discords in an undertone,
  And marred our harmony.
"The past is ours, not yours," they said:
  "The waves that beat the shore,
Though like the same, are not the same,
  O, never, nevermore!"

The author of the above remarkable stanzas is also unknown. The poem is entitled *Again*, and Poe must have admired it greatly, though he never mentions it in any of his essays or criticisms on poetry. The fact is that Poe not even once praised the poetry of an anonymous poet, although not much of the poetry of his day escaped his notice. *Again* probably was written in America half a century before Poe.

Undoubtedly Poe had read a great number of similar stanzas without being overmuch impressed. Not even Lowell's *Threnodia* could make him see the possibilities of the word "nevermore." No wonder. Lowell was no metricist, his stanzas lack that undefinable something which irresistibly appeals to us in spite of ourselves. This is the way not to write poetry:

Gone, gone from us! and shall we see
These sibyl-leaves of destiny,
Those calm eyes, nevermore?
Those deep, dark eyes so warm and bright,
Wherein the fortune of the man
Lay slumbering in prophetic light,
In characters a child might scan?
So bright, and gone forth utterly!
O stern word—Nevermore!

Poe saw nothing to admire in this. "Nevermore," without a rhyming word in close proximity, he hardly noticed.

Evermore, however, opened wide his eyes. He scanned the stanzas, and his unerring eye and ear found them almost fault-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

less; the few irregularities only served to heighten the unique metric, rhythmic, and rhymic effects. The theme was highly, genuinely poetic. Presently, however, the weirdly melancholy, pessimistic soul of Poe saw one great fault with the poem. Here were everlasting life, joy, friendship and love promised to all human beings weary of their earthly struggles; here was everlasting hope for all despairing souls. Why eternal hope and bliss? Why not eternal despair and suffering? The antithesis could not be avoided or ignored. And all of a sudden the word "nevermore" stood in letters of fire before his mind's eye. He added the letter "n," and "evermore" became "nevermore." The rest was comparatively easy. And to me it seems very natural to think that *Evermore* was printed in one of those old volumes Poe mentions in *The Raven's* opening stanza:

> Once upon a midnight dreary, while I pondered, weak and weary,
> Over many a quaint and curious volume of forgotten lore.

It would be only a waste of time and energy to speculate upon the question where Poe got the idea of the speaking raven. Prof. H. E. Shepard says regarding this problem:

> The *Legend of the Raven*, related by Roger De Hoveden, and referring to the era of the Latin conquest of Constantinople, nor the *Legend of Herod and Agrippa*, cited by De Quincey in his celebrated essay on *Modern Superstition*, furnishes an adequate foundation for the text of Poe's masterpiece. The raven has constituted a prominent character in English poetry for many ages. In *Hamlet*, in *Macbeth*, in *Sir David Lindsay*, in Tickell's exquisite ballad of Collin and Lucy, the appearance of this ominous bird of yore will readily suggest itself to all lovers of our dramatic and lyric poetry. But none of these can be considered as the precursor of Poe's *Raven*. The nearest approach to any distinctive feature of *The Raven* is to be found, I suspect, in the dramas of Shakespeare, those unfailing sources of intellectual nutriment. The one word "Mortimer" of Henry Percy's starling, presents a marked phonetic resemblance to the "Nevermore" of *The Raven*, whose melancholy refrain seems almost the echo of the starling's unvarying note.

Or did Poe, as Markham thinks, borrow the idea from Dickens's *Barnaby Rudge?* In his review of that novel Poe writes:

> The raven, too, intensely amusing as it is, might have been made, more than we now see it, a portion of the conception of the fantastic Barnaby. Its

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

croakings might have been prophetically heard in the course of the drama. Its character might have performed, in regard to that of the idiot, much the same part as does, in music, the accompaniment in respect to the air. Each might have been distinct. Each might have differed remarkably from the other. Yet between them there might have been wrought an analogical resemblance, and although each might have existed apart, they might have formed together a whole which would have been imperfect in the absence of the other.

Poe's review of *Barnaby Rudge* appeared in *Graham's Magazine*, February, 1842, three years before he published *The Raven*. Poe moved from Philadelphia to New York in April, 1844. *The Raven* was published on January 29, 1845; and as the poem, so far as known, was not written in Philadelphia, it must have been written in New York some time during the year 1844. Poe never told anyone *when* he composed it.

The Raven was published under the *nom de plume* of "Quarles." Why did Poe publish the poem anonymously? Did he fear and expect some metreaster would at once discover the close resemblance between *The Raven's* and *Evermore's* stanzaic form and rhyme-scheme, not to speak of the "strange and thrilling refrain," with its "long sonorous *o's* and *r's* swelling on the ear and the memory in anthemlike ululations"? He probably did. But there was little danger. There seems to have been not a single metricist of note in Poe's time, just as there are very few abroad today.

In their search for the prototype of *The Raven* the enemies of Poe and professional hunters after plagiarisms have ransacked almost the whole of the world's literature. The result is not worth mentioning. For example, one "Outis" thought that Poe, in the repetition of the fourth and fifth verses of his stanza, had imitated Coleridge's *The Ancient Mariner*. Poe wrote:

> It shall clasp a sainted maiden whom the angels name Lenore—
> Clasp a rare and radiant maiden whom the angels name Lenore.

"Outis," by running two of Coleridge's verses into one,

> For all averred, I had killed the bird that made the breeze to blow.
> "Ah, wretch!" said they, "the bird to slay, that made the breeze to blow!"

produced a somewhat similar effect. But it is preposterous to trace the quaint repetition of *The Raven* to that source. Poe's

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

enemies must indeed have been desperately jealous, having to resort to such criticism in order to belittle his fame.

The Swedish lyrist Stagnelius (1783–1823) invented or borrowed somewhere this remarkable stanza-form and rhyme-scheme:

Att vid månans bleka strimma
Jag i dalens silfverdimma
Vandrar mången enslig timma
  För ej trädda spår;
Att mot himlarandens blånad
Stum jag ser med namnlös trånad,
Och en suck af kvalfull brånad
Då från hjärtat går.

Now, by running two of these verses together the interior rhyme-scheme of *Evermore* and *The Raven* is exactly reproduced, as can be seen at a glance:

Att vid månans bleka strimma jag i dalens silfverdimma
Vandrar mången enslig timma för ej trädda spår;
Att mot himlarandens blånad stum jag ser med namnlös trånad,
Och en suck af kvalfull brånad då från hjärtat går.

The second and fourth verses of the above arrangement want only a trochee to agree even as to metre with the four first verses of Poe's stanza. With the unknown's stanza it would agree entirely, as his is only a repetition of octametres acatalectic and heptametres catalectic. Stagnelius is called the "Keats of Sweden," but in all his voluminous work there is not to be found a single trochaic octametre verse, except as arranged by myself in the above illustration.

To trace all the elements of which Poe, with his rare erudition, built *The Raven* would be an impossible and thankless task. But it cannot be denied that there exists an elemental affinity between *Evermore* and *The Raven*. The music, the rhythmical swing of the verses, is the same. The very atmosphere of the two poems is alike, and this in spite of the awful gloom of the one, and the bright consolation of the other. Both possess a passionate metre-creating motive. Poe borrowed, only that he might create a greatly superior work of art. But he kept silent about the prototype of *The Raven*.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AFFAIRS OF THE WORLD

EDITORIALLY REVIEWED

THE ECONOMICS OF DEFENSE

Conspicuous in the aftermath of comment upon the failure of the latest efforts at naval limitation is a protest against American insistence upon equality with Great Britain in strength, on the curious ground that the latter country is dependent upon its foreign trade, of which its fleet is a necessary guardian, while the United States is not. The fact is that America is vitally concerned in the protection of its foreign commerce; not perhaps for the sake of its very life, but at least for that prosperity which makes life worth living. One-sixth of all the farmers in the land, and a like proportion of other industrialists, are dependent upon foreign markets. One-third of our vast oil products, one-fifth of our manufactures of agricultural machinery, one-fourth of sewing machines, one-fifth of cash registers, one-third of typewriting machines, one-fifth of cigarettes, are sold abroad. Other great industries—manufactures of locomotives, automobiles, telephones, electric lamps, clothing, furniture, paints and what not else—are as dependent upon imports for materials as England is for food. Such considerations give the stamp of industrial and economic approval, even of agricultural approval, to the insistence that the foreign commerce of America shall be protected equally with that of any other Power.

WHERE WAR IS OUTLAWED

The demand of the British Labour Party that their Government shall make a treaty with America outlawing war between the two countries was well meant but superfluous. A few months before The North American Review was founded a treaty was made which declared that—

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There shall be a firm and universal Peace between His Britannic Majesty and the United States and between their respective Countries, Territories, Cities, Towns and People, of every degree, without exception of places or persons.

That was a hundred and thirteen years ago, and that treaty still stands, unbroken and unbreakable. In all that time never once has either country armed itself against the other, and today the British Prime Minister, Mr. Stanley Baldwin, proclaims to the world that "war between the two is unthinkable".

A SOVIET *BRUMAIRE?*

The repudiation and expulsion of Trotsky may well mark an epoch in the Russian Revolution, comparable with some events in the French Revolution; between which and the former there have already been some striking parallels. One hesitates to determine, perhaps, whether to bracket it with the fall of Danton, or of Robespierre. But it is difficult not to anticipate the advent of a 9th Thermidor, and then of an 18th Brumaire.

IRELAND FOR IRELAND

With no wish nor purpose to take sides as between the two major parties in the Irish Free State, we must frankly declare that some features of Mr. De Valera's course cause an unfavorable impression. So, notably, did his half confession, half complaint, that he was just starting for America to raise funds for his party when Mr. Cosgrave called for a general election and thus prevented his coming, and caught Fianna Fail with an empty campaign chest. With the use of money, however much or little, in Irish politics, we have no concern. But we do think it high time for Irish politicians to cease making America their banker and their fighting ground. Such use of this country was carried to the extreme of endurance at the time when a comparatively united Ireland was fighting politically and otherwise against Great Britain. With all our sympathy with the Irish desire for self-government, it was not agreeable to have the controversy

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

between those two countries made an issue in American politics. But to have that process continued as between the two factions in Ireland itself, and to have rival Irish politicians campaigning against each other in America and seeking American "sinews of war" for the domestic feuds of the Free State, would be quite intolerable.

REPLENISHING THE EARTH

Nonsense is uttered as fluently as water runs over a dam about emigration as a cure for over-population and about immigration as a means of filling up a sparsely settled country. It is a law as fixed and invariable as that of the Medes and Persians that birth rates vary in accordance with migrations. Just as fast as emigration relieves pressure in crowded countries, the birth rate ncreases to supply the deficit; and just as fast as immigration pours into a country to fill it up, the native birth rate declines. In token of the former, note Signor Mussolini's call for ten million Italian babies, and the copious response that is being made to it. For proof of the latter, a simple arithmetical computation will show that if the birth rate in America had remained what it was a century ago, and not a single immigrant had come to these shores, our population would have increased just as rapidly as it actually has, and would have been today just as large as it is. We may add that there is a similar emission of nonsense about the alleged overcrowding of some countries. China is often referred to as a land the intolerably dense population of which will one day burst all bounds and overflow upon America and other sparsely settled regions. In fact, China has a population of only seventy-five to the square mile; while that of New York is 218 and that of Illinois 115 to the square mile. Why should China, then, "pour her surplus people into our great open spaces"?

"AMURATH TO AMURATH SUCCEEDS"

The recent unprecedented mortality among Presidential candidates and their promoters in Mexico suggests that the present Government is no less intolerant of political opposition than was

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that of Porfirio Diaz. Indeed, we must regard its ways and means as even more strenuous and ruthless than those which the "Black Eagle" usually employed. At the same time it must be doubted if it possesses—certainly it does not display—a tithe of the administrative efficiency that signalized his protracted reign. Each country to its own taste. We decline to be censorious of Mexican methods. But as disinterested spectators we may perhaps be permitted to express, as between despots of varying characters, a preference for one who is at least efficient if not always benevolent.

WHO BEGAN IT?

We must regard with hearty sympathy the adoption by the League of Nations of Poland's proposal to outlaw aggressive wars. But we should esteem it with much more optimism if it were coupled with a convincing definition of "aggressive wars" upon which all nations would agree, and also with some effective prescription for enforcement of the decree of outlawry. Who was the aggressor in 1870, France or Prussia? Can you get the Allies and the Central Powers to agree as to who began the World War? Ask Hindenburg! Then ask Clemenceau! Our own one aggressive war was that of 1898, with Spain; but what should we have said to its being outlawed by Europe? As for enforcement, or even observance—the nations of the world never entered into a more solemn compact than that of 1907 at The Hague; nor was any agreement in the history of the world ever more flagrantly and contemptuously and universally disregarded. So while we may have hope of good from this Polish proposal, also "we hae' oor doots".

FRANKLY FRANKING

For many years abuse of the franking privilege has been one of our Governmental scandals; and it seems not yet to have been abated, but rather to have assumed a new and still worse form. Members of Congress used to send by mail under their franks all sorts of merchandise, including carpets and grand pianos. But now a United States Senator has offered to furnish his franks

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wholesale to anybody and everybody for the transmission of campaign literature calculated to advance the political interests of his party and to oppose those of his rivals. That is simply making the Nation pay personal and partisan campaign expenses. Just suppose that Mr. Coolidge had chosen to run in 1928, and had announced that he would give his Presidential franks for all Republican campaign documents!

AN ENVOY OF PRESTER JOHN

Few incidents in recent diplomatic history have exercised a more fascinating appeal to the imagination than the announcement that America will probably soon accredit a Minister to Abyssinia, and receive one from that country. Perhaps there are still some old timers who remember Curtis's inimitable *Potiphar Papers*, or have had the gumption to look up that classic in a library and revel in its delicious humor. If so, they will recall the Minister from Sennaar. Well, Sennaar is not in Abyssinia, rather in the Soudan, near by; but an envoy from that place would have seemed scarcely more extraordinary than one from Ethiopia, as Abyssinia is hereafter to be known; as of course it should be. We may be skeptical of the stories of the descent of the Neguses from Solomon and the Queen of Sheba, and also of the classic traditions of Prester John. But at any rate, since the Christian Powers of Europe have consented to the destruction of Armenia, Ethiopia clearly ranks as the oldest surviving Christian nation in the world. It is also well to be reminded, as we shall be in this new contact, that despite the almost universal misuse of the word in that sense, an Ethiopian is not a Negro, but belongs to the Semitic race. This new foreign relationship may not be as important as that with some other country, but it will certainly be one of the most picturesque.

BRAINY, AND OTHERWISE

One of the latest triumphs of feminism is the establishment of the proposition that women have as much brains as men. Of that we are assured by the Curator of the Burt G. Wilder Museum

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of Brains at Cornell University; as a result of his examination of the brain of the late Mrs. Helen H. Gardener, formerly United States Civil Service Commissioner. It is not claimed that the brains of women are as heavy as those of men, but that the wealth of "gray matter" and its appurtenances amply compensates for the lack of mere avoirdupois. This explanation of the basis of equality must be gratifying to the sex, as it would be a dubious satisfaction to know that there was merely an equality in weight. We recall that the brain of Geronimo, the old Apache warrior, weighed precisely the same as that of Daniel Webster!

THE EAGLE AS VERMIN

In probably the best known, if not the best, Tyrtæan ode in American literature, the American Eagle is apostrophized as "Majestic Monarch of the Clouds" and "Child of the Sun", to whom "'tis given to guard the Banner of the Free". We wonder how many of the millions of young Americans who in past years declaimed Drake's thrilling verses anticipated that under the sanction of the American Congress that same bird would be officially classed as vermin and a bonus of a dollar a head be publicly paid for its destruction and extermination. Yet such is the case today, with the result of the annual slaughter of more than forty thousand Eagles. Perhaps in view of this outlawing of the National emblem it was well that a few years ago its image was removed from our coinage and its place there filled with the effigy of a cross between a pip-stricken buzzard and the lulu-bird of joyous tradition. It would indeed have been a little too raw to pay blood money for the killing of Eagles with coins bearing that bird as their chief device.

VICTORIAN FLAPPERS

Lady Southwark has been describing the conservatism, the restraint and the deadly dulness of the life of young women in early and mid-Victorian days; conditions which doubtless seem quite impossible to the young women of today. Yet it was in the very

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

times of which Lady Southwark writes that Mrs. Lynn Linton portrayed "the Girl of the Period" as a creature quite as formidable and revolutionary as the Flapper appears in our own age.

CITY AND NATIONAL POLICE

The government of New York City has recently added seven hundred more men to its police force, with general public approval. There had indeed been much public demand for an increase of the force, and still further additions would not be censured as excessive. It might be profitable, even if somewhat embarrassing, for our pacifist friends to observe that this addition makes the New York police force, in proportion to the population, more than twice as large as the Army of the United States. If our standing army bore the same relation in numbers to the population of the United States that the New York police force does to the population of that city, it would be more than twice its present size. According to Euclid, the whole is greater than any of its parts; wherefore we infer that the United States is at least as much entitled to an efficient police force for the Nation as its chief city is to one for municipal use.

"GEORGE" DEPRECATING TIPS

It cannot be so, of course; and yet it is, certainly and indisputably. "George" wants no more tips. That is to say, the multitudinous host of porters in Pullman cars—some seven thousand of them—want the tipping system to be abolished, and in its place to be regularly salaried. What that would mean, in two directions, may be estimated from the authentic statement that these seven thousand men receive an average of a thousand dollars a year each, in tips from the passengers whose gripsacks they mix up and whose necks they scratch with whiskbrooms. That means, then, a total of seven million dollars which the public pays in lieu of wages to the nominal employes of the great corporation. Perhaps the public does not mind that drain upon its finances. But we feel confident that the Pullman Company

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would very considerably mind having the fee system abolished and being itself called upon to add seven millions a year to its budget, to pay George's wages.

A BATTLE OF THE BOOKS

The Right Reverend A. F. Winnington, Bishop of London, complains that hatred of England is taught in many American school history books.

The Hon. William Hale Thompson, Mayor of Chicago, declares that those history books are filled with pro-Anglican propaganda, insidiously and treasonably designed to make us all vassals, peons and serfs of King George.

When Messrs. Tunney, Dempsey, Sharkey, *et al.*, become worn and tedious as a twice-told tale, it might add to the gayety of nations to have these two distinguished protagonists of international comity meet in some ample stadium for a new Battle of the Books.

PROGRESS IN THE AIR

With some commendable abatement of the mania for spectacular and usually disastrous "stunt flying", popular interest in aviation appears to have declined. Yet there is good reason for it greatly to increase, in view of the steady if quiet and unobtrusive expansion of practical air service. People think vaguely of the air mail, when they see the special letter boxes provided for it or hear the planes droning overhead; but not many, we judge, realize that the twenty-four airways are carrying mails to considerably more than one-half of the population of the United States. These are not, as at first, Government enterprises, but are conducted by private corporations, carrying the mails under contract, just as do the railroads. It is in such development as this that the vision of seeing "the heavens fill with commerce" is being realized. We may hope that Colonel Lindbergh's aerial tour of the forty-eight States—accomplished with the same marvellous precision that made his transatlantic flight a wonder of the world—will bring this fact home to the minds of the American people.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE NORDIC INFLUX

One of the most interesting effects of our restrictive immigration laws, coupled doubtless with political and social conditions in Europe, has been the large relative increase in Nordic accessions to our alien population, and especially of English-speaking peoples. This is of course accompanied by a corresponding decrease in Latin and especially Italian immigration. Actually, nearly one-half of the incomers in the last three years have been English-speaking people, many of them from Great Britain and Ireland, but most of them from Canada and Newfoundland. That means that the proportion of English-speaking immigrants to the whole number is now about four times as great as it was before the war. On the other hand, the Italian influx has been transformed into an exodus, the number returning to Italy exceeding that coming to America. Whereas in the three years immediately preceding the World War the net increase in the Italian-speaking population of America was more than 447,000, in these last three years there has been a net decrease of 32,246. It seems probable that the next few years will see the number of Italians exceeded by that of Mexicans, and the latter thus become the largest non-British element among the immigrants. At the present time Mexicans constitute nearly one-fifth of the entire alien influx. It will be a significant change from former conditions, to have the bulk of immigration into the United States come from the two great countries immediately adjoining us at the north and south, particularly as in neither of them does the urge to remove arise from over-population. In fact, we have the spectacle of extensive migration from sparsely-settled countries into one more densely populated.

NASBY IS DEAD

The prospect of placing all remaining classes of postmasters in the classified Civil Service, to be selected for merit and appointed for life, must be strange news to the shade of Petroleum Vesuvius Nasby, in the Elysian Fields. To get the appointment as post-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

master at "Confedrit X Roads", Kentucky, was the supreme ambition of that formidable protagonist of the *ancien régime*, and he regarded it as a proper and inevitable perquisite of triumphant partisanship. We can imagine his divine ire at the spectacle of candidates for that appointment engaging in a competitive examination as to their education, experience and general fitness for the office. It would cause him to think that he had "fit, bled and died" in vain.

A CENTURY OF MATCHMAKING

Let us honor the day of small things. We have celebrated the centenary of the railroad, the half-centenary of the telephone, and what not other anniversaries of great inventions. But it was just a hundred years ago that there was made one of the smallest, simplest and cheapest of devices, which has yet been used a million times more than all these others put together and is, in fact, one of the most indispensable objects in civilization. The friction match was invented by John Walker, of Stockton-on-Tees, England, in September, 1827. Room, in the Hall of Fame!

NOT "HARD BOILED" CRIMINALS

The once familiar phrase "hardened criminal" is obviously falling into desuetude, and if present tendencies continue we may before long have to abandon it altogether, or else regard hardening as a very rapid process of youth. The up-to-date criminal is young in years, and is growing younger. Analyzing 25,000 representative felonies, the Crime Commission of New York State reports that the average age of robbers of all kinds is not over twenty-three years, and that of burglars, specifically, is somewhat less. Grand larceny is usually committed by persons between twenty-five and thirty years of age, and forgery and fraud by those of thirty. The most serious crimes of all kinds, including arson and murder, are chiefly committed by youths who have not yet completed their twenty-fifth year. In these circumstances there is ground for curious speculation. What becomes of these young criminals? Why is it that they do

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not become "hard boiled" in age? Do they reform? Do they die? We are pretty sure that they do not all get locked up for life. It may be gratifying that careers in crime are not as long continued as they formerly were, though it is deplorable that many boys take to evil ways when scarcely yet emerging from their teens. The one indubitable reflection is, of course, the need of more efficient moral training, in homes and schools; a corollary of which is the pertinent question whether the home or the school is the more neglectful of duty—or whether they both alike fail.

SELF IMPOSED BURDENS

In discussion of new or revised proposals for agricultural relief, stress continues to be laid upon the burden of taxation which farmers suffer, with a certain looking toward the Federal Government as responsible for it and as therefore being the source from which abatement is to be required. No view could be more mistaken. It is doubtless true that farmers, in common with most other people, are burdened with taxes; perhaps overtaxed. But that is something with which the Federal Government, whether Executive or Legislative, has nothing whatever to do. The fact is that Federal taxes and the National debt are being reduced at a rate unprecedented in history; that State taxes and debts are pretty generally increasing; and that municipal taxes and debts are increasing by the proverbial leaps and bounds, at a rate never known before. Millions of citizens are paying as local taxes a larger percentage on their entire property than Federal taxation requires merely of their income.

Thus the closer the taxing power comes to the taxpayers themselves, the heavier are the burdens which it imposes. Perhaps this is necessary and inevitable. But it is certainly a circumstance which should be understood and kept clearly in mind; particularly when making out income tax returns, and when discussing ways and means of relief from the burden. Whatever assistance the Federal Government may give to the farmers, it cannot take the form of reduction of taxes which it does not levy.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE CRACKER BARREL PHILOSOPHER

BY BURGES JOHNSON

THE Deacon is a persistent pipe smoker. A gift of a new pipe is certain to please him. He admires it and fondles it, polishing its shiny surface with his thumb, but I notice that he seldom smokes it. He may try it out for a day or so after its arrival, but then he adds it to his collection and returns to a mangy corncob, or a scarred and ancient imitation briar that may have cost him all of fifty cents years ago at the general store. Early in our acquaintance I made the mistake of offering him a cigarette. He said nothing, but the look he gave me from under his bushy brows, and the way in which he promptly spat into the fireplace, took the place of words.

So it was with some surprise that I noted, on my latest visit, a package of cigarettes at the edge of the centre table near his hand. "You're not trying those?" I asked, pointing at them.

He looked at me solemnly. "Bought 'em for Ma," he said. "But she won't even try 'em. She's upstairs an' won't come down. I might even have to get my own supper."

I made no effort to conceal my astonishment. I had never happened to see the dear old lady even slightly moved from her even temper over any household matter. In certain whimsical moods the Deacon was wont to charge her with strange improprieties of motive or conduct, but her invariable acknowledgment was a maternal smile and a bird-like lift of her head, and then she would proceed with her knitting or her housekeeping as quietly as ever.

"Isn't she feeling well?" I asked anxiously.

"She's all right," he grinned. "But you see daughter was home for a visit, with some new notions, and she must have talked Ma into trying to do something about my habits. Anyhow, Ma talked to me today. I knew she was going to from the way she acted all morning; and when she got to talking I knew it wasn't her idea. She said fashions changed, and while it was all right once for a man to sit in the sitting room in his shirt sleeves with his suspenders showing, and no one thought any less of him, folks were a little different now, and some visitors might not understand if they dropped in and caught me. She said too,"—here the Deacon looked particularly solemn,—"that mebbe I spit just a mite more'n I needed to, or ought to. I didn't argue with her. I saw it was hurting her more that it hurt me. But when I came in this afternoon I had these cussed things with me, an' I offered 'em to her. First I ever bought, I guess. And I told her we'd got along together nicely just as we was, for quite some time, but that I was willing to modernize if she would. Oh, she's all right," he added reassuringly; "but it must have cost her some effort to pass along that lecture, and she don't like I should have the last word. Probably she's writing to Abigail and taking it out on her."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"I never understood your feeling about cigarettes," I said, borrowing one from the offending package, though I am not over fond of them myself. "You can't regard tobacco as a vice, with a pipe like that in your hand."

"Of course tobacco's a vice," he said, fondly regarding the odorous old briar; "I never claimed I hadn't any vices. But I believe in acknowledging the ones I've got. The worst kind of a vice a man can have is the one that he doesn't admit, either because it's a secret one, or because he's forgotten he's got it. I claim that a man can get to smoking cigarettes so that he doesn't realize he's smoking 'em, or how many he's smoked, even though they're disguised as incense. And folks are so used to 'em *they* don't realize he's smoking 'em, unless maybe he pokes one into his girl's eye, and then she remembers.

"Now this pipe," said the Deacon, filling it in an almost reverential manner, "isn't wearing any disguise, and if I mean to smoke her I have to prepare for it. She calls for about ten matches to start her, and a cord of wood to keep her going. My conscience has plenty of time to chirk up and ask me if I ain't ready yet to quit the habit. And when she's lit, everybody else knows I'm smoking. Yes-sir-ee, she's an honest-to-goodness vice, like a black cigar. She isn't masquerading, and I take some pride in knowing that nine out of ten of the young cigarette smoking loafers around the general store if they tried her would get seasick."

* * * * *

The Deacon puffed placidly after his outburst, and I carefully restored my cigarette, unsmoked, to its original package. "I don't care for them much myself," I said meekly; "but I can't see that the doctors have proved much against them. Of course no one ever claims that tobacco is really good for a man, but the statistics as to the harm it does seem contradictory."

"I guess I hate statistics worse than I hate cigarettes, and in the same sort of way," said the Deacon. "It's how people use 'em that gets me indignant. I read in a paper the other day that a doctor said that sixty per cent. of the babies that died under two years of age had parents that smoked cigarettes. He might be right, at that. But I bet that ninety per cent. of 'em had parents that were forced to eat predigested breakfast foods at least one morning a week. How can he tell which of those shameful conditions killed the baby? And did he ascertain the habits of the parents of all the babies that lived to grow up and eat such foods themselves, and then pass the horrible appetite on?

"Statistics!" said the Deacon animatedly; "they're a kind of a vicious habit themselves, or else they're a disease. From what I read in the papers, it's a disease that preachers and college professors and public speakers are specially liable to."

"How about professional statisticians?" I suggested.

"Well, I expect they're like typhoid carriers; they've got the ailment permanently, it don't hurt 'em, and they give it to other people. But the harm is done by the fellow who goes around with a lot of statistics in his mouth that he can't chew and digest. Sometimes he's funny and sometimes he's dangerous. And I guess even the regular statisticians get hold of a lot of stuff they can't handle. They know it's true and they know they got it by sweat and blood and questionnaires, so they think it's the whole truth."

The Deacon was giving me a good deal of solid comfort. "It's the cause of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

education that suffers most from misused statistics," I hazarded. "It's so easy to count teachers and school children and students and then ask them questions and make deductions. Not long ago a magazine writer counted up the college students in the United States, estimated the expenditure of an average student during four years of college, multiplied that by the total number, and stated that parents were spending the total enormous sum on their children's education, which was not worth it. His figures might have been right as far as they went, but he forgot to deduct, among other things, the amount earned by students working their way through college, or working in the summer to pay their own expenses. That figure alone would knock his deductions to pieces. And he left out millions in scholarships and loans."

The Deacon nodded thoughtfully. "Yes, that sounds like a statistician," he said. "But I doubt if the educators get it worse than the farmers. The figurers have reduced us to dollars and cents, or they have us sliding up and down graphs like roller coasters. The trouble with them seems to be that they forget we are human beings and think we are just numbers. The efficiency expert is worse than the statistician, but he belongs to the same breed. He will tell you that if a farmer's boy can pick six quarts of cherries in an hour, and a girl five quarts, the two of them together will pick nine quarts. But any farmer knows that the two of them together won't pick any."

* * * * *

The next time I saw the Deacon, his comments on statistics were still in my mind and I brought him a bit of scientific deduction from the pen of one Wilbur D. Nesbit, of Chicago: "If a fox terrier two and a half feet long, with a tail three inches high, can dig a hole ten feet deep in an hour, to dig the whole Panama Canal in two years would require a fox terrier eighty-eight feet long, with an eight foot tail." The Deacon seemed pleased with this. "It's mighty useful to know," he said, "and that fox terrier belongs with the half-a-baby that every Harvard man has. From some statistics I read quite a while ago, the Vassar graduate ought to get more comfort out of her children because she has one whole one and seven-eights of another.

"I suppose I am an average newspaper reader," said the Deacon, "but I'm not as ignorant about colleges as the newspapers seem to think, and I know a good deal about the young people that graduate from 'em, just by mixing my common sense with my statistics. As I remember it, a Pittsburgh man figured out that Harvard graduates were not reproducing themselves, and neither were the young women who went to the eastern colleges for women, and so these great schools must be a menace to our future civilization.

"From what I've been able to deduce," continued the Deacon, "I disagree on two counts; on account of his facts, and on account of his conclusions. Whatever is left may be all right!

"My daughter's boy, Abner, is at college now, and his mother went before him. He was her first baby, and it's my recollection that when he was born she not only mentioned it to her class secretary, but she probably wired the Dean. When the second one came along, she was slow about getting it into the college statistics, and by the time the third one arrived she wasn't even paying her dues as a member of the grand old class of 'umpty-umph. I ought to know. She and Henry were living here at the time. And what's more,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

none of those grandchildren of mine are what you might call fractional."

"But don't you think it would be a serious business if college graduates weren't doing any better than barely reproducing themselves?"

"Well," meditated the Deacon, "at my age I can't do very much about it; and furthermore, I ain't worrying. Those same figurers tell me that only about three per cent. of the young folks of college age go to college, and it doesn't affect the total population much if they don't reproduce. What we need 'em for is leaders, not breeders. Perhaps if they were all celibates, like the scholars in the middle ages, and furnished the world with three per cent. of scholarly experts and intellectual leadership and no children at all, they'd justify all we spend on their education. Mind you, I don't say they shouldn't have more children, but I don't get all het up about it.

"There's something wicked about printed numerals," he continued.

"They say figures don't lie," I retorted feebly.

"Generally speaking, a horse is an honest critter," said the Deacon; "but most folks that deal regularly in 'em get to be liars."

* * * * *

I stayed to supper, and the Deacon did not have to get it for himself. Afterward he did not let me go at once. Our topic was sticking whimsically in his thoughts. "There's no such thing in the world as a number," he said, going back into the dining-room and returning with the unfinished plate of doughnuts. "I et four of these, if I remember rightly," he said; "and I suspect I'm going to eat another. But you can't eat or taste or smell a *four* or a *five*. A number is a symbol. In itself it doesn't exist. But folks that deal too much in numbers get to thinking that they are things, and forget all about what they are numbers *of*. An efficiency expert gets to counting the number of motions my hired man uses when he plants a potato, and he forgets both the potato and the hired man. Then he shows the man how he can plant more potatoes with fewer motions, and he persuades me to pay the man more, because he gets more done."

"That's a fine thing," said I, warmly. "There's too much lost motion in our industrial life."

"Mebbe you're right," said the Deacon; "I ain't dealing in generalities. All I know is that the man quit work and left me in a hole. He said I worked him too hard. But the only way he knew I was working him too hard was because he had never earned so much before, and it made him feel tired when he drew the pay."

"But that was absurd, and doesn't prove anything."

"It proves," said the Deacon, "that the expert was dealing with figures, and I was dealing with the dumbest Swede in the State of Massachusetts. It proves that if an expert could leave a Swede like that out of his calculations, he was the dumbest of the lot of us."

The Deacon's wife had entered the room and was redding up the centre table. I had a premonition that she would soon wind the clock, so I rose to take my leave. The Deacon smiled at me ruefully. "I don't exactly choose to go to bed," he said, "but I guess I don't do all the choosing that's done around here."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IN RETROSPECT

[IT IS THE PURPOSE OF THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW TO REPRINT IN EACH NUMBER PERTINENT EXCERPTS FROM ITS ISSUES OF A CENTURY OR MORE AGO.—*The Editors.*]

SAMUEL GILMAN, *the eminent theologian, poet and critic contributed an "Essay on Postures" to* THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW *for July, 1817, in which he wrote:*

The most universal, easy, and gentlemanlike is dominated the *cross-kneed* posture. All ranks, classes, and ages of males, together with some individuals of the other sex, cultivate this attitude with very happy success. It is no uncommon thing to see as many as sixteen or seventeen in a company who, throughout an entire evening, most patiently and heroically persevere in this inoffensive mode of arranging the nether limbs. The child of three years of age adopts it among the first imitative accomplishments which excite the joy and admiration of his parents. The aspiring school boy, by piling one knee upon another, adds a year to his existence, and bodies forth the dignity of the future man. The youth, who is just entering the world, who has a letter of introduction to Mr. —— of Boston, or New York, or Philadelphia, would be put to infinite embarrassment, if the privilege of crossing his knees were denied him. But without going through every age for the illustration of this division of our subject, I proceed to observe, that the cross-kneed posture is not to be adopted by all persons, at all times, and on all occasions. It is much too nice and trim for everyday use. I know many a respectable farmer who will never sit in this fashion, except in his best suit, on a Sunday, or at a board of Selectmen, or at the examination of a district school, or when visiting an acquaintance in town. What, sit cross-kneed and erect in a plain frock and trowsers, and on a common working day? Why, Sir, it would be as preposterous and uncommon as to read the Bible on a Monday, or to fix one's thoughts and eyes during the offering up of prayers on a Sabbath. . . .

I would remark, by the way, that the cross-kneed posture is now almost out of use with the other sex. For what reason they themselves best know. There was indeed an attempt, about five or six years since, to get up the fashion among ladies, of adopting this posture, and at the same time of bending over the upper foot, so as to make it form a crescent. She, whose foot could describe the most complete curve, was envied and admired by all her competitors. But, alas! Mr. Editor, there are but few persons whose feet are sufficiently flexible to enable them to shine in this accomplishment. And so it was dropped. Out of a company of twenty-five ladies whom a friend of mine

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reconnoitred the other evening at a tea party, twenty-one sat with their feet parallel and together; two, a matron somewhat advanced, and a maiden lady, whose old associations of gentility induced them so to sit, were found in the cross-kneed predicament, and the remaining two, being the youngest of the whole company, had drawn their feet under their chairs, and crossed them there.

Those who think this late summer of 1927 was queer will be interested to know what that of 1816 was like, as observed by Professor CHESTER DEWEY *at Williams College, Williamstown, Mass., and recorded by him in* THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW *for May, 1817:*

The very singular seasons of 1816 will long be remembered. The mean temperature of the summer months was several degrees lower than common. Frosts are extremely rare in this region in either of the summer months; but in this year, there was frost in all of them. June 5th at noon, the temp. was 83°. June 6th the temp. about 44° through the day—snowed several times. June 7th, no frost, but the ground frozen, and water frozen in many places. Moist earth was frozen half inch thick. June 8th, some ice was seen in the morning—earth very little frozen. June 10th, severe frost—Indian corn, beans, cucumbers and the like, cut down. The corn grew again. June 11th, severe frost. Ten days after the frost, the trees on the sides of the hills, whose young leaves were killed by the frost, presented for miles the appearance of having been burned or scorched. The same appearance was visible in parts, at least, of Connecticut and, also, on many parts of Long Island. July 9th, frost this morning which killed the parts of cucumbers. Aug. 22d cucumbers were killed by the frost. Aug. 29th, severe frost. Some fields of Indian corn were killed on the low grounds, while that on the higher lands was unhurt.

SIR WALTER SCOTT *is not commonly regarded as a corrupter of English speech. Yet he was thus arrainged by* WILLIAM TUDOR, JR., *in an elaborate critique of "Guy Mannering", in* THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW *for September, 1815:*

There are, however, considerable defects. It must always be in some degree confined to Scotland, as so much of the dialogue is in the peculiar dialect of that country; add to this the cant language of the gypsies and smugglers, and the Low Dutch of Dirk Hatteraick, and a great part of the dialogue must be mere gibberish to the majority of readers without a glossary. Besides all the unintelligible words from these sources, the author has ventured on coining one or two new ones. *Appetising*, from the French *appetissant*, is a convenient term, but it is not English—and there is an instance of the modern fashion of making all substantives plural, which only adds to the hissing sound of the language, without any increase of force; the word is *neatnesses*, which is absolutely barbarous.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Those who see need of improvement in the public schools of today may be heartened in their efforts by recalling what ORVILLE DEWEY, *the eminent theologian and educator, had to say of the common schools of Massachusetts as they were a hundred years ago; in* THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW *of January, 1827:*

In the first place, better schools are wanted. We mean that the Free Schools, or what are usually called the Common, and in the country, District Schools, need to be made better, and more efficient organs of instruction and influence. . . . We would ask our easy and unsuspicious advocate of the present systems to look about him, and to mark the restlessness, or reluctance, or stupidity, that pervades all these schools. He will find some pupils reading, what every tone of their voices tells him they do but half understand; some, poring over the pages of a grammar, or hunting out the parts of speech in a dictionary, a work altogether mechanical, of the principles of which they understand literally nothing, and of which there are thirty-five chances out of forty that their master understands as little; others, he will find studying geography, in such a way that they comprehend it as vaguely as we do the geography of the moon, and care about it a great deal less than some of us do about that luminary, who see in it volcanoes, and city walls, and the shadow of towers; and others still, scowling over a perplexing *sum* in arithmetic, to which they apply no other logic than that of the multiplication table. . . .

We are not now accusing the people of gross ignorance; though we apprehend that their intelligence is overrated, and that some of our boasting on this point were better spared. The truth is, we forget that our language on this subject is only comparative. When we speak of our intelligent population, we mean that it is more intelligent than that of Europe generally; but we are apt to transfer this comparative sense of what we say into an absolute estimate. Be it admitted, however, that the yeomanry of this country is distinguished for intelligence, and as much distinguished as any one desires to maintain, still we say that nothing of this intelligence, but the instrument, is obtained at our Common Schools, that is, at the generality of them, for there are, it is true, a few honorable exceptions. Our citizens, as they come into life, gain, indeed some general acquaintance with the state of the world, and with the politics of their own country; but this they gain, not from school books, but from newspapers. Of all that they actually know in the world, of all the habits of right reflection and conduct, by which they are guided in the pursuits of life, the schools, we say again, have furnished nothing. . . . The empire of these States must rise or fall with the mind. The *schools* hold, in embryo, the future communities of this land. The *schools* are the pillars of the republic. To these, let the strong arm of the Government be stretched out. Over these, let the wisdom of our legislatures watch. Let not the needful scrutiny and support be withheld, lest their very foundations silently moulder away and the fabric of empire sink in their ruins.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The proposal to build a hospital for the insane evoked an excellent bit of fooling from WILLIAM POWELL MASON, *the eminent lawyer and Reporter of Justice* STORY'S *Decisions, in* THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW *for September, 1817:*

To effect a separation between the sane and insane persons of the community, seems indeed to be a most desirable object, take it in whatever point of view we may; but the manner and means of best effecting this separation, under existing circumstances, is not so plain and obvious, I apprehend, as some may choose to think it, but will be found, on the contrary, to require no little consideration and forethought. The first and fundamental error of the intelligent gentlemen who have planned this institution, arises, I conceive, from an incorrect estimate of the number of insane persons in the community. . . . In consequence of the late successful attempt at the establishment of the above institution, I was led, with the assistance of a friend who is well versed in these things, to make some calculations as to the relative numbers of the sane and insane in this country, and after a very laborious and exact estimate, we arrived at the following results.

Taking the term insane, in its most general signification, to comprehend all persons of disordered minds, we classed them under such several heads as their different degrees of insanity seemed to demand, and after this manner found, that the number of those totally deprived of reason, and who in vulgar language are denominated *Stark Mad*, amounted to about *one* out of every *thousand* persons;—*Staring*, to about *one* out of every *hundred;*—*Insane*, in its most confined sense, to about *twenty-five* out of a *hundred*, or one quarter part;—*Persons beside themselves*, to about *fifty* out of a *hundred;*—*Insane* in *its most extensive sense, deranged* or *cracked*—which three terms are nearly synonymous —to about *nine hundred* out of every *thousand;* this last class being understood to include in it all those going before. . . . I venture, after due reflection, most respectfully to propose, that the present plan be so amended, as that, instead of an hospital for the *insane*, this establishment be exclusively appropriated to the use of the *sane*.

It would be impossible to enumerate, within the limits I have proposed to myself, all the advantages of such an arrangement. To notice a few of them only;—we may observe, in the first place, that in this way all obstacles with regard to numbers immediately vanish; for it is apparent from the preceding statement, that let but a strict examination be had upon admission, and there will not more persons be found in the whole community, properly qualified, than would serve to people a very moderately sized establishment.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED